

J. K. Bible Appendix
A BRIEF
E S S A Y
ON THE
CHRONOLOGY
Of Some P A S S A G E S

Contained in the

Holy Scriptures:

by Watts.
V I Z.

- I. OF the Seventy Weeks in the Prophecy of DANIEL.
- II. OF the Time of CHRIST's Birth,
- III. OF the Time when *John Baptist* began to preach, &c.
- IV. OF the Time of CHRIST's Baptism.
- V. OF the Time when our Blessed Saviour began his Sacred Ministry, of Preaching, working Miracles, &c.
- VI. OF the Time of *John Baptist's* Imprisonment.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. ROBERTS at the *Oxford-Arms* in
Warwick-lane. 1733.

E. S. A. Y.

CHRONOLOGY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN

Holy Scriptures:

43.

8. 8.

287



LONDON

Printed for J. Roberts at the Office of the



A BRIEF
E S S A Y
O N T H E
C H R O N O L O G Y
O F

Some P A S S A G E S contain'd in the
Holy Scriptures, &c.

THE Author of these Sheets pretends to very little Knowledge of the original Languages of Scripture: Nor, to have read a great many Authors.

That which gave me the first Occasion of making the following Remarks was, the reading of some Notes on the *New Testament*, by the late learned Dr. *Wall*, and especially his Translation of *Luc* iii. 23. Having formerly read what the Doctor had occasionally written concerning the Age of our Blessed Saviour, in his *Defence of the History of Infant Baptism*: And observing that he had there overcome the greatest Difficulties which seem'd to lie in the Way of a Reconciliation between the Evangelists in this Matter, by giving a proper rendering of the Words *Luc* ii. 2. concerning the Time of the *Tawing*; and also

(from Arch-bishop *Ussher*) a true Account of the 15th Year of *Tiberius*: Yet there seem'd, as I thought, plainly to be a Difficulty still remaining. For the utmost that could be gain'd by these two Helps was, that Christ should be born in the latter part of *An. Per. Jul.* 4709, (which was very few Months before *Herod's* Death) and, that Christ was baptized presently after the Calling of *John Baptist*. Both of these Suppositions are manifestly contrary to some Texts of Scripture: And whoever reads what the Doctor has here said, will observe that he plainly saw this Difficulty, but could not then surpass it, by reason he had not then a right Conception of the Words *Luc* iii. 23. Now upon reading the Doctor's Translation of this Text in his *Notes*, I soon perceived that the foresaid Difficulty is, by this, removed. I did a little wonder to find that, notwithstanding this, he has still set the Birth and the Baptism of our Saviour as he had before done. I at first questioned whether he might think it a Case of such Importance as to enlarge at all upon it in his *brief Notes*. But on second Thoughts I am rather apt to believe that he did not happen to animadvert to the Difference that his Construction of this Text might make in this Matter.

Observing this, and also some few other of the Doctor's Notes on some Passages which have respect to the last Proposition in these Papers, I drew up some brief Remarks (exactly to the Purport of the following) and communicated 'em to a learned Friend of *Dr. Wall's*, to whom he had intrusted the Publication of his *Notes*, after his Decease, with a Liberty to alter, &c. as is expressed in an Advertisement prefixed to his *Notes*.

For having a Value for what this learned and worthy Man has written (of whose Abilities, and

of the Service he has done the Church by his Writings, the learned World have no need to be informed) I took the Liberty to communicate my Thoughts on these Matters as is abovesaid; thinking, that some few and small Alterations in these Matters (if allowable) in a second Edition might be a small Addition of Credit to the Doctor's Book: and especially, thinking, that it might help to rectify some Errors which had been before entertained.

But that Gentleman, with Modesty and Candour, returned in Answer. "I don't think there are any Alterations to be made in what the Doctor has written, even tho' he be mistaken in it; for it is his Judgment which the World are to find in his Writings, and not the Corrections of others, unless approv'd first by the Doctor. And this is what I have religiously adhered to in all that I did in the Publication."

But was withal pleased to add. "I have not time to examine the Authors concerned in the Chronology you mention, with Accuracy enough to give my Opinion in the Matter, but my present Thoughts are, that your Remarks would not be unacceptable to the World, as setting on foot a new Enquiry into the Reasons why the later Chronologers have differed from the former, &c."

The Prophecy of *Daniel* is what Dr. *Wall* had indeed no Occasion to speak to. But it must be observed that this Prophecy has an Influence on some Passages that have respect to the Birth, &c. of Christ, and will give some Light in the last (and, as I think, most difficult) Case here proposed. And it may be observed that all the Passages here mentioned, have an Influence on, and Connection with, each other. Besides, I am some-

something apt to question whether any of our learned Moderns may have given a true and satisfactory Account of the Method of computing the Time spoken of in this Prophecy. This I speak, only from what I find in Dr. *Prideaux* (having read no other on this Subject.) But as he was a learned, and a late Writer, I judge he would take notice of the most considerable Writers on this Subject, before him.

Instead of making any farther Apology for the publishing of these few Remarks, I will humbly intreat so much Candour from the learned Reader (if any such shall condescend to see what is here said) that if he perceive what is here propos'd, to appear like Truth, at least, as far probable as the Case will allow, he will not reject it for want of Learning in the Author, especially in Things of this Moment. And if any thing which is here intimated should happen to give an Occasion to any one of Learning and Ability, to set these Passages in so clear a Light, that Scripture may not appear inconsistent with Scripture, nor with other authentic History, it is all that is here aimed at.

From what has been said, the Reader must not expect that I should go to *Ptolemy's* Canon, for the Time when *Artaxerxes* reigned ; nor to the *Roman* Historians, for the Time when *Tiberius* began to govern the Provinces in Consortship with *Augustus*, or for the Time of *Augustus's* and *Tiberius's* Death ; nor to the Fathers, &c. The Citations here produc'd, and referred to, are taken at second hand, but from Authors of so much Esteem for Learning and Probity, that no Reader who can't search the Originals, will have any doubt of the Veracity of the Citations, and they who can, will be able to satisfy themselves.

SECT.



SECTION I.

I will begin, with making some Observations on Dr. *Prideaux's* Explanation of the Prophecy of *Daniel*.

It may be premis'd, that there are several Things which the Doctor has said in this Matter, that are manifestly consistent with Reason ; as namely, that these seventy Weeks were to be seventy Weeks (or Sabbaths) of Years, such (for Number of Years) as had been usual among the *Jews* before the Captivity, *i. e.* each Week to contain 7 Years, and so, the whole Time to be 490 Years : That these 490 Years were to terminate in the Death of CHRIST : That these 70 Weeks are afterwards (in the Prophecy) divided into 3 Periods, *viz.* 7 Weeks, in which time the Building of *Jerusalem*, with its *Street* (or Streets) and *Wall* (or Ditch, or Breach, or Ruins) was to be completed : That then, the second Period of 62 Weeks was to commence, at the End of which, Messiah was to come : That this coming of Messiah did commence with the Preaching, &c. of CHRIST's Messenger, *John Baptist* : At which Time the last Period of 1 Week was to commence : That in the middle (or latter half) of this Week, CHRIST himself was to abolish Sacrifice, &c. By his Preaching the Christian Religion, &c. and by the propitiatory Oblation of himself as a Sacrifice for Mankind, by being *cut off, but not for himself* at the End of these 70 Weeks : That the *Darius*, in whose
time

time the Temple was finished, was *Darius Hystaspis*: That the *Artaxerxes* in whose Time *Ezra* and *Nebemiah* came to *Jerusalem*, was *Artaxerxes Longimanus*. (Concerning the *Artaxerxes* in *Ez.* iv. and the *Darius* in *Neb.* xii. some Words may be necessary by and by.) These are Things of which there can, I think, little question be made. Those which are here to be remarked on, are the following. The Volume of Dr. *Prideaux's Conn. of Hist.* here referred to, is that in 8vo. Part I. p. 265. Ed. 1716.

“ The Month *Nisan* *An. Per. Jul.* 4256. was
 “ the very Year and Month in which *Ezra* had
 “ his Commission from *Artaxerxes Longimanus*
 “ King of *Persia*, for his return to *Jerusalem*,
 “ there to restore the Church and State of the
 “ *Jews*”.

’Tis evident that the Doctor here mis-reckoned the Time by one Year; for tho’ *Artaxerxes Longimanus* did begin his Reign *An. Nabonaf.* 284. which was coincident with *An. Per. Jul.* 4250. And so, tho’ his seventh Year was (as the Doctor here says) in *An. Per. Jul.* 4256. yet it was only the beginning of his seventh Year which fell in this Year of the *Julian* Period; for his Reign began in the latter part of a *Julian* Year, as is evident, by comparing *Ez.* vii. 7, 8, 9. with *Neb.* i. i. and ii. i. So that his seventh Year must have began sometime between *July* and *November* 4256. Therefore that Part of his seventh Year in which *Ezra* returned into *Judæa*, i. e. in *Nisan* (*April*) must be in *An. Per. Jul.* 4257. From whence to *April* 3. 4746. (the day of Christ’s Passion) there were but 489. Years. The same Mistake he made p. 363. concerning the time when *Nebemiah* went up. See *Newton’s Chron.* p. 354. and in *Chronicle*.

No

No Reader need be told that the Method by which the Years of *Nabonassar* were computed, could make no difference in this case. As the first Year of *Nabonassar* did commence from February 26. O. S. *An. Per. Jul.* 3967. therefore *An. Nabon.* 284. begun about *December* 17. *An. Per. Jul.* 4249. But as this is a later Month than that in which *Artaxerxes* began his Reign, therefore 'tis plain that his Reign did not begin till in, or about, Autumn 4250. If it be said, That here is a Possibility that this King's Reign might begin in *An. Per. Jul.* 4249. because that as *An. Nabon.* 304. (in which this King's twentieth Year begun) did begin about *December* 12. and as the *Jewish* Month *Cisleu* usually began about the middle of *November*; and that it might be in the latter End of *Cisleu* that *Nehemiah* c. i. 1. says, was in the King's twentieth Year, therefore, 'tis possible that his twentieth Year was but just begun at this Time. I answer, that as this is but barely possible, so, if any one will please to examine and compare the following Passages, he will plainly see that this King began his Reign a good while before *December*.

1. From the foresaid Texts, 'tis evident that his Reign began sometime between the first Day of the fifth *Jewish* Month (about the middle of *July*) and some part (but what part uncertain) of the ninth Month, which began about the middle of *November*.

2. From the Account given by Dr. *Prideaux* p. 404, 405. (observing that the Year of *Nabonassar* in which *Artaxerxes* died, began about *December* 7.) 'tis plain that his Reign began sometime within 4 Months from the Beginning of *September*.

3. From the Account given by Sir *Isaac Newton*,

JB

ton,

ton, *Chron.* p. 354. 'tis plain that his Reign commenc'd within seven Months from the Death of *Xerxes* who died about the End of Winter.

From these several Calculations, 'tis plain that this King's Reign began very little after the latter Part of *August*. Sir *Isaac* sets it a Month or two before the Autumnal Equinox.

Dr. *Prideaux's* Mistake was not in misplacing the Beginning of this King's Reign, for he set that Right; viz. in the Year before Christ 464. but he did not observe that *Ezra* and *Nebemiah* returned into *Judæa* in the succeeding Years of the *Julian* Period to those in which this King entered on his seventh, and on his twentieth Years.

His next Argument is to this Effect, p. 266. &c. viz. " The Words, *to restore and build Jerusalem*, and (p. 289.) *The Street and the Wall*, (or Ditch) *shall be built again*, are not to be understood literally, but figuratively, for the restoring of the State of the *Jews*, as well the Political as the Ecclesiastical &c." i. e. (as he explains it p. 289.) " The Church and State of the *Jews* is figuratively expressed by the *Streets* of the City. And, such good Constitutions and Establishments as should be necessary for the fortifying and preserving of the same, are figuratively expressed by, the *Ditch*." For says he, p. 267. &c. " If these Words are to be understood in a literal Sense, they can be applicable to no other restoring and rebuilding of *Jerusalem*, than that which was decreed and commanded by *Cyrus* at the Release of the Captivity. For this Prophecy was revealed to *Daniel* before this Release. And therefore, of what Decree can it be more properly understood, than of that which should first be granted next after this Prophecy for that purpose

" pose

“ pose &c.” And, that *Cyrus* was the Man who should build *Jerusalem*, is plain, says he, “ Because it had been prophesied of him, by *Isaiab*, “ *That he should build the City &c.*” And that *Jerusalem* was rebuilt by Vertue of *Cyrus*’s Decree, is plain, says the Doctor p. 268, “ For the Complaint of the neighbouring Nations to the “ *Persian Court*, against them that were returned, “ was, *Ex. iv. 12.* That *they builded Jerusalem* “ *that rebellious and bad City, and had set up the* “ *Walls thereof, and joined the Foundations of it.* “ And the Order from King *Artaxerxes*, (so the “ *Magian* who then reigned, it seems, called “ himself) was, *to cause the Jews to cease, that this* “ *City be not builded.* However from the first of “ *Cyrus* to the Time of this Order, fourteen “ Years having elapsed, the rebuilding of *Jerusalem* had by that Time gone a great Way &c”.

Now this is, I think, the best Argument the Doctor brings to support his figurative Hypothesis: And had his Reasons been solid for shewing that *Cyrus*’s Decree gave Orders for building the City *Jerusalem*, this Argument had been difficult to be answered. But they are, I think, very deficient. The two before-mentioned are the only Reasons (of any Moment) which he gives to shew that *Cyrus*’s Decree gave Order, or License, for building the City. I shall reply more particularly to the latter of ’em. A Reader who has Sir *Isaac Newton*’s *Chronology* by him may pass over what is said on this Point, because he may there see a Confutation of this Opinion: But as this little Piece may fall into the Hands of some who may not happen to have Sir *Isaac*’s Book by ’em, (and also because the *Abstracter* of Sir *Isaac*’s Book has not followed him in this part of the History) I will use some Words to shew the Doctor’s Error in this Case.

The Doctor would have it, that the *Artaxerxes* in *Ez. iv.* who prohibited the building of the City, was *Smerdis* the Magian, who reigned about 14 Years after *Cyrus's* Decree, i. e. between the Reign of *Cambyfes* (whom he would have to be the *Abasuerus Ez. iv. 6.*) and *Darius Hystaspis*. For says he, p. 175. " That *Cambyfes* was the " *Abasuerus*, and *Smerdis* the *Artaxerxes*, that " obstructed the Work of the Temple, is plain " from hence, that they are said (*Ez. iv. 5, 6, 7.*) " to be the Kings of *Persia*, that reigned be- " tween the time of *Cyrus*, and the time of that " *Darius*, by whose Decree the Temple was " finished, i. e. *Hystaspis*."

Now this Assertion is all a manifest Error, for these Kings are not placed in that Order as the Doctor here places them: for *Darius* is named by *Ezra c. iv. 5.* before *Abasuerus* and *Artaxerxes*, nor did either *Abasuerus* or *Artaxerxes* obstruct the Work of the Temple, but the Obstruction that *Artaxerxes* gave was, to the building of the City. As to any Obstruction that was made by *Abasuerus*, there is nothing said, only, that the Enemies of the *Jews*, wrote unto him an Accusation against the Inhabitants of *Judah* and *Jerusalem*. The Doctor's Mistake in this Matter does plainly appear, by his confounding the building of the Temple, with the building of the City, for *Ezra* had made a plain Distinction between them. The Dr. here, p. 268. makes the Order of *Artaxerxes* to prohibit the building of the City; and so it did: But then this is utterly inconsistent with what he says in several other Places, p. 175. 181. 277. &c. where he makes the Order of *Smerdis* (his *Artaxerxes*) to prohibit the building of the Temple; whereas in the whole Relation concerning *Artaxerxes, Ez. iv. 7. &c.* there is not one word of the Temple, but only,

only, of the City, which shews (as Sir *Isaac* says) that the Temple had been finished before.

A small Observation of the Circumstances in this Case, and, of the Method of *Ezra's* writing, will convince any one that this ivth ch. of *Ezra* (i. e. from v. 6. to v. 23. inclusive) is to be read as in a Parenthesis, thus, [Now when the Adversaries of *Judah* and *Benjamin* heard that the Children of the Captivity builded the Temple, &c. then the People of the Land weakened the Hands of the People of *Judah*, and troubled them in building, and hired Counsellors against them, to frustrate their purpose all the Days of *Cyrus*, even until (*there he passed over Cambyses and Smerdis*) the Reign of *Darius*. (And in the Reign of *Abasuerus*, (*Xerxes*) in the beginning of his Reign wrote they, &c. And in the Days of *Artaxerxes* (*Longim.*) wrote, *Bishlam*, &c.—Be it known unto the King that the *Jews* who came up from thee to us, (*Ezra with his company c. vii.*) are come unto *Jerusalem*, building the rebellious and the bad City, &c.—Then sent the King an Answer unto *Rehum*, &c.—Give ye now command to cause these Men to cease that this City be not builded, &c.—Now when the Copy of King *Artaxerxes's* Letter was read before *Rehum*, &c. they went up in haste to *Jerusalem*, unto the *Jews*, and made them to cease by Force and Power.) Then ceased the Work of the House, unto the second Year of *Darius*.]

Now these Words do directly import that the building which was obstructed from the time of *Cyrus's* Decree, until the Reign of *Darius*, was only the building of the Temple; therefore the following Words, v. 7, &c. could not be spoken of *Smerdis* who was Predecessor to *Darius*; but of some Successor to *Darius*. And the Words,

Words, *v.* 24. (Then ceased the Work of the House) must not be taken as a Consequent from the Prohibition of *Artaxerxes* (for that was against building the City) but as a Consequent from what had been related, *v.* 1—5. all the intermediate Words being in a Parenthesis (as a Procedure to shew the whole Oppositions of their Enemies to *Ezra's* own time) : And then at the End of this Parenthesis, *viz.* *v.* 24. he resumed his History (which had ended *v.* 5.) with regard to the Temple, and proceeded *c.* *v.* *vi.* to shew how that was finished in the 6th Year of *Darius*. He uses pretty much the same Way of Writing (tho' in shorter Words) in *c.* *vi.* 14, 15. where he says of the Temple (they builded and finish'd it, according to the Commandment of *Cyrus*, and *Darius*, (and *Artaxerxes*) : And this House was finished in the 6th Year of *Darius*.

No one can doubt who this *Artaxerxes* was, nor can it be thought that the Temple was finish'd in the 6th Year of *Darius* by Command of *Artaxerxes*, for his Command concerning the Temple was 58 Years after the 6th of *Darius*.

As *Darius* is twice named by *Ezra* in *c.* *iv.* it must indeed be suppos'd that he did use a *returning back* in some part of his History here : but then 'tis plain that he did this at *v.* 24. Had he at *v.* 6. then gone back to shew what manner of Oppositions were made during the Reigns of *Cambyfes* and *Smerdis*, he would not have said, *and in the Reign of Ahasuerus* ; but, *for in the Reign, &c.* So that 'tis plain that these Words do proceed to new Matter, *viz.* to relate the Occurrences in the Time of the Successors of *Darius*, *i. e.* *Xerxes* (*Achschirafsch*, *Achsweros*, *Oxyares*, *Achfuerus*, *Assuerus*, or *Abasuerus*, or (as Margin) *Abasbverofsch*. See *Newt. Chron.* p. 309.

353.) and *Artaxerxes Longimanus*. Sir Isaac says that *Abasuerus* is erroneously written by the *Masoretes* for *Achsuerus*: and as it appears by the Margin that the Name in the present *Heb.* is *Abasbverosh*; by changing *Aba* into *Ach*, the Name will be *Achsbverosh*, which is manifestly the same with *Achweros* or *Xerxes*. And then, the Name *Artaxerxes* answers for itself.

'Tis much that the Doctor should (p. 274.) have recourse to that mistaken Account, 1 *Esd.* v. 73. where the Compositor or Transcriber, instead of saying, as it is *Ez.* iv. 5—24. that *the Building ceased until the 2d Year of Darius*. They have made it that it *ceased for two Years, until the Reign of Darius*. This seems plainly to be the Error of some Copyer. 'Tis set right in the Margin. The Doctor has added even to this Mistake, for he has doubled the Expression, and says, the *Building ceased for two Years until the second Year of Darius*.

This *Apocryphal* Account of the Building ceasing for two Years until the Reign of *Darius*, would not suit the Doctor's Hypothesis, because the whole Reign of *Smerdis* was only an Usurpation of 7 Months; he was hardly seated on the Throne before he was cut off. And this is another strong Argument against the Doctor's Opinion, for here was not Time sufficient for the *Samaritans* to have heard of his coming to the Throne, and to consult about writing to him, and then to send, and the Messengers to wait till *Smerdis* had got the Records search'd (which were sometimes at a great Distance from the Court) and then to receive his Order; for 'tis suppos'd that only the Journey to and fro, from *Shushan* (where *Smerdis* was) to *Judea*, would take up at least 6 Months. See *Connect.* p. 172. 184.

Had it been *Smerdis* that prohibited the building of the City ; since there were but two Years from his Time to the 2d Year of *Darius*, it might be supposed that the Names of the Men who wrote these Letters (that to *Artaxerxes*, Ez. iv. and that to *Darius*, c. v.) would have been (one at least) the same, as Governor of *Samaria*, &c. whereas now it appears that they are quite different.

The Doctor instead of saying, p. 268. *against them that were returned*, should have said (as it is, Ez. iv. 12.) *against the Jews who came up from thee to us*. There was no going up of the Jews in the Time of *Smerdis*, but in the Time of *Artaxerxes* there was.

The Words of *Nebemiah*, chap. i. seem utterly to confute this Notion. Here 'tis said that upon some People coming from *Judea*, *Nebemiah* asked them concerning the State of the *Jews*, and of *Jerusalem*, and they informed him of the bad State of both, and that the *Wall of Jerusalem was broken down, and the Gates thereof burnt*. Now this can't mean the breaking down of the Wall by the *Babylonians* when *Jerusalem* was destroyed by 'em, (as the Margin means,) because that since that time it had been set up again by the *Jews*, Ez. iv. 12. Nor could it be any breaking down of the Wall in the Time of *Smerdis*, for his Time was 77 Years before the Time that *Nebemiah* made this Enquiry ; had it been broken down before he was born, it would have been no News to him, for he was too zealous for *the City of his Fathers Sepulchres*, not to have heard of it from his Youth, had that been the Case. Therefore it must have been some late breaking down of the Wall, and, by all Circumstances, the Case must be (as Sir *Isaac Newton* takes it) that upon *Ezra's* going up and appointing Magistrates, &c. They (tho' *Ezra* had no Commission for it) made

made an Attempt to build the City, and, as it would seem, had made a good Progress in the Wall: but as soon as they had repaired the Wall, and begun to build the City, their Enemies (knowing they had no Commission for it) wrote to the King, and procur'd an Order from him to stop the Building: And then they broke down the Wall and burnt the Gates, and probably, did also demolish what small Building they had made in the City. And this could not be long before the Time that *Nehemiah* heard of it, for it was but little more than 12 Years before this that *Ezra* came to *Jerusalem*, and the Work must take 'em up some Years, whenever they went about it.

This breaking down of the Wall, &c. is not indeed mention'd by *Ezra*, c. iv. 23. but it must be so suppos'd, by being compared with these Words in *Neb.* i. And there is no doubt but that when the *Samaritans* had obtained an Order for causing the Building of the City to cease, they would conclude that it gave 'em leave to demolish the Buildings that had been made; and they had so much Rancour against the *Jews*, that they would not fail to take all the Advantages of 'em that they possibly could.

These Reasons are, I think, sufficient to shew that it was *Artaxerxes Longimanus* who prohibited the Building of the City. Now tho' this was about 80 Years after *Cyrus's* Decree, yet had his Decree given leave for building the City, it may be suppos'd that the *Jews* would then have appealed to it, for their Enemies prayed the King, to search Records much farther back, which he did, *Ez.* iv. 15. 19. And *Ezra* himself was then at *Jerusalem*, and he must know the Contents of *Cyrus's* Decree.

Ezra did four times make mention of *Cyrus's* Decree, and yet said not a Word of any Orders therein

therein for building the City, which surely he would have done, had it contain'd any such Thing ; for I think it was an improbable Conjecture of Dr. *Prid.* p. 268. to think that *Ezra* might omit this Order in his Abstract of *Cyrus's* Decree. No one will, I think, doubt that *Ezra* would have accounted the Licence to rebuild *Jerusalem* as one of the chief Things to be recorded.

What Dr. *Prid.* (p. 268. 288) has spoken concerning *Hagg.* i. 4. is of little Consideration in this Case. It was too licentious a Construction of the Prophet's Words to say that *Jerusalem* had then many Streets and cieled Houses in it ; he should first have shewn that there were *cieled Houses*, before he had said, *many Streets*. Those cieled Houses may full as well be supposed to have been in some other Cities of *Judea* as in *Jerusalem*. And how could it with reason be said, p. 268. That *Haggai* complained of the *Jews* at *Jerusalem*, that they dwelt in cieled Houses while, &c. whenas the Word *Jerusalem* is not found in the Book of *Haggai.* *Zechariah*, who prophesied at the same time with *Haggai*, seems plainly to speak of *Jerusalem*, not as of a City then built, or begun to be built, but, that should be built. See c. i. 16. and ii. 1. &c. When the Prophet saw, in a Vision, a Man with a Measuring-line in his Hand, going to take the Dimensions of *Jerusalem* : This is plainly, the Representation of a City that had then few, or no Buildings in it. But this Opinion of the Doctor's is sufficiently confuted by what was said before ; for if there was no Attempt made to build the City till after *Ezra* went up (as 'tis plain there was not, for they were then *joining the Foundations*,) then there could be no considerable, if any Buildings in it in the Time of *Haggai*, which was 60 Years before.

What

What seems to put it out of all doubt that *Cyrus's* Decree did not give any leave for building the City, is, that *Nehemiah*, above 90 Years afterwards, said, c. ii. 3, 5. That the City then lay waste, and prayed for leave to go up and build it.

Now as it seems to be very plain (as plain as such a Case can well be supposed) that *Cyrus* did not give any Order for building the City, therefore 'tis plain that what had been prophesied by *Isaiab*, is not to be taken in so strict a Sense, as to suppose that *Cyrus* should himself compleat all those Things which were there predicted. It is said, c. xlv. 13. *He shall build my City*. If this were taken in an absolute strict Sense, then it must be supposed that the City should have been all rebuilt in *Cyrus's* Life-time, which yet it is plain that it was not, not even 100 Years after. *Cyrus* was the Man that did begin those things which *Isaiab* had foretold (and there should seem no need for the Prophet to have multiplied Names in such a case) and he, by passing a Decree for the Return of the Captives, and for building the Temple, did make way for building the City also, and so, may be said to be (in a large Sense) the Author or Occasion of building the City, tho' the Decree for that was not given till 85 Years after his Death, by one of his Successors, i. e. *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, Neh. ii.

N. B. That *Josephus* (Ant. l. xi. c. 1.) Tho' he do say that *Cyrus* order'd the Building of the City (which Error seems to have been caused by his mistaking the Sense of Ez. iv. (for he takes the *Artaxerxes* here mentioned to have been *Cambyses*.) Or perhaps, from 1 *Esd.* c. ii. for this Author, v. 18. unskilfully intermingles the Building of the Temple with that of the City) yet, I

say, *Jos.* does not take it that *Isaiab* had foretold that *Cyrus* should decree the Building of the City.

I have been the longer on this Case of *Cyrus's* Decree, because it helps to clear up a considerable Difficulty: For if it were thought that he had decreed the Building of the City, then it would have made the Matter very uncertain, where to fix that Command, or Word, that was to go forth for restoring and building *Jerusalem*, predicted by the Prophecy.

And it would not only perplex the Matter, in case of building *Jerusalem*, literally, but also, in the Case of such a figurative Building, as Dr. *P.* has conjectured. For it might, I think, pretty easily have been discerned that this Argument, taken from *Cyrus's* Decree (had it been pursued home) would make a very strong Argument against any such figurative Building: For

1. Taking the Case, as it really seems to be, *i. e.* That *Cyrus's* Decree did not give any Order for building the City: Yet as he was the Man who did release the *Jews* from their Captivity under an Heathen Nation, and did allow, enable, and order, 'em to return into their own Country, and to build their Temple, in order to have their true Worship there restored, and did appoint a Governor over 'em, I should be apt to think this will be counted the first Command that went forth for restoring and building the Political and Ecclesiastical State of the *Jews*: For tho' their State was (as the Doctor, *p.* 266. says) as yet but imperfectly restored, yet still, it was a restoring, and was, doubtless, the first after the Prophecy: But if it be considered, in what State the *Jews* were, under their Captivity, *Cyrus's* Decree will, I think, be counted as great a restoring as (if not a greater than) that which was afterwards made

made by virtue of *Artaxerxes's* Commission to *Ezra*. But then

2. If it were supposed that *Cyrus's* Decree did also give Order for building the City ; this will still more perplex the Matter : for if he did release the *Jews* from their Captivity, and allow and order both their City and Temple to be rebuilt, then doubtless his Decree will be taken for the first Command to restore and build *Jerusalem*, whether in a literal, or a figurative Sense. So that both these Arguments don't very well accord. The Doctor would strenuously maintain that *Cyrus* gave Order for building the City, in order to set aside any literal Building from being understood by the Words in the Prophecy ; not considering that such a Concession does much perplex the Matter, with regard to his figurative Building.

Another Argument which the Doctor uses in defence of his figurative Scheme, is to this Effect, viz. p. 290. 410, &c, “ That *Ezra* and *Nebemiah* continued, successively, in their Office “ of labouring to restore and build the Political “ and Ecclesiastical State of the *Jews* for just “ 49 Years, which is the Period of Time that “ the Prophecy had allotted for restoring and “ building *Jerusalem*.” And the Reasons he gives to shew that their Office lasted just so long, are, “ Because as *Ezra* had began this Reformation in the 7th Year of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, “ the Time for which it was to last, would expire in the 15th Year of *Darius Nothus* : And “ as the last Act of Reformation performed by “ *Nebemiah* (c. xiii. 28.) is said to have been done “ while *Joiada* was High Priest ; and as the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* ascribes to each High Priest “ such a Number of Years as brings down the “ first of *Joiada* to the 11th of *Darius Nothus*.”

And,

And, says the Doctor, p. 411. " That which
 " determines me to place it (this last Act
 " of *Nebemiab*) in the fifth Year of that Priest-
 " hood, rather than in any of the four preced-
 " ing, is, the Prophecy of *Daniel*.

Whatever else may be said in this case; every Reader will see that this last mentioned *Reason* of the Doctor's is a *Petitio Principii*. He seems here, p. 411. to have been apprehensive that his Reader would think he had set the Expulsion of *Manasseh* (Son of *Joiada*) too low, because (as will presently appear) the Book of *Neb.* seems plainly to set it higher. His Reason for setting it in this Year is, because the *Chronicon Alex.* (which, says the Doctor, best agrees with Scripture, &c.) has set the first Year of *Joiada* in the 11th of *Darius Notbus*. And his Reason for setting the Expulsion of *Manasseh* just in the 5th Year of *Joiada* (neither higher nor lower) is, the Prophecy of *Daniel*, i. e. provided that any Words in the Prophecy must be taken in a figurative Sense, which was the Question.

'Twill, I think, pretty plainly appear that the Doctor does here carry down the Office of *Nebemiab* (and consequently, the *Old Testament* History) too low by 15 Years at least. It must be observed, that *Neb. c. xiii. 6.* says, *In the 32d Year of Artaxerxes, came I unto the King, and after certain Days (or Years) obtained I leave of the King. And I came to Jerusalem, &c.* Now Dr. Prid. p. 397. supposes this Absence of *Nebemiab* from *Jerusalem* to have been for about 5 Years, and possibly it might. Now 'tis plain, v. 7, &c. that as soon as he returned, he set himself about reforming the several Corruptions that had crept in during his Absence, as namely, v. 8. turning *Tobiah* out of the Temple. And v. 10, ordering the

the Tithes to be duly paid to the *Levites*. And, *v. 15. In those Days*, he reformed the Abuse of the Sabbath. And, *v. 23.* he concludes thus. *In those Days also saw I Jews that had married, &c. — And one of the Sons of Joaida — the High Priest, was Son-in-law to Sanballat, — therefore I chased him from me.*

It can't reasonably be thought that the Words *v. 23. In those Days*, should refer to a Time 19 Years after that which was last mentioned, *viz.* in *v. 6.* It would be a little Absurd to suppose this, for had the Book of *Neb.* gone down so low as where Dr. P. carried it, yet even then, the whole Time of which his History treats, would be but 36 Years; so that in such case it must be supposed that the foresaid Words were used by *Nebemiah* to denote a Space (from the Time last mentioned) of above half the Time of which his History was treating, which is such a Method as very few Historians have ever used. Besides, had *Nebemiah* continued in his Office among the *Jews* for near 20 Years after his Return from *Persia*, it is not likely that these Enormities would have happened. Dr. P. himself, *p. 397.* does, I think, suppose that the *Jews* had run into all these Corruptions in *Nebemiah's* Absence, and 'tis very reasonable to think that the Marriage of *Manasseh* was while *Nebemiah* was absent, and 'tis no ways reasonable to suppose that *Nebemiah* would suffer *Manasseh* to continue 18 or 20 Years with him, after he had married the Daughter of *Sanballat*. Sir Isaac Newton, *Chron. p. 365.* says that this Expulsion of *Manasseh* was in the Reign of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, for which he cites *Joseph. Antiq. l. xi. c. 7, 8.*

This Expulsion of *Manasseh* was, most probably, while *Joiada* was High Priest, *Neb. xiii.*

28. So that the Difficulty is, to guess at the Time of *Eliashib's* Death. If that *Eliashib*, c. xiii. 4. were the High Priest (of which some, it seems, have doubted, *Connect.* p. 399.) then 'tis plain, he was living after the 32^d Year of *Ariaxerxes*, and by the *Eng.* at v. 7. one might guess that he was living when *Nebemiah* returned from *Persia*. If he were then living, 'tis pretty plain, he must be of a very advanced Age.

I will mention a few Circumstances with regard to the Ages of those High Priests, which will, I think, shew that there is not much Credit to be given to the *Chronicon Alex.* in this Matter; at least, not if the Meaning of it must be taken as Dr. P. represents it. It is reasonably judged that *Jeshua* must have been 40, and his Son *Joiakim* 20 Years old in the first Year of *Cyrus*, Ez. iii. 9. *Connect.* p. 273, 279. This is the least that was possible, they might be more. Now *Jeshua* is said to have held the Office for 53 Years, *Connect.* p. 232. Then he must have lived to 93. and *Joiakim* would be 73 at his Father's Death; and he is said to hold the Office 30 Years, p. 309. then he must live to 103. Now as *Joiakim* was 20 in the first of *Cyrus*, and as there were 123 Years from the first of *Cyrus* to the 11th of *Darius Notus*, then *Eliashib* must either be born after his Father was 43. (which is much beyond the common Course of Nature, in case of Primogeniture) or else he must live to 100. If that *Jobanan* Son of *Eliashib*, Ez. x. 6. were *Eliashib's* Grandson by *Joiada* (as Sir *Isaac Newton* supposed) then *Eliashib* must be, at least 60 at that time, then he would be toward 90 at the Time when *Nebemiah* returned from *Persia*, and would be above 100 in the 11th of *Darius Notus*. And these Circumstances carried on, would

shew the two next, *Joiada*, and *Jobanan* to have lived to still greater Ages. Such incredible Ages must be suppos'd when *Jeshua*, who had Sons of 20 and upwards when he entred on the Office; is made to continue in it for 53 Years.

If there were any History or Tradition of any Credit (from which the Authors of the *Chronicon Alex.* had it) that *Jeshua* continued High Priest for 53 Years, then 'tis most probable that the Years of his Office were dated from the Time of his Father's Death: for tho' *Jozadak* died in Captivity, yet there is no doubt but that he and his Son *Jeshua* held the Name and Title of High Priest of the *Jews* successively, from the Time of the Death of *Sergiah*, tho' they could not, while in a strange Land, execute all those Parts of their Function, which they might have done in their own Country. *Josephus*, *Antiq.* l. x. c. 10. calls *Jozadak* High Priest while he was in *Babylon*. And 'tis possible that *Jozadak* might die a good many Years before the Release of the *Jews*. Now by such a Reckoning, the Death of *Eliashib* may be set several Years higher than where Dr. P. set it; for the Reason of his setting *Eliashib*'s Death in the 11th of *Darius Notbus*, is not, that the *Chron. Al.* sets the Death of each High Priest in such or such a Year of such a King's Reign, but only, that this *Chronic.* makes *Jeshua*, *Joiakim*, and *Eliashib* to have held the Office, successively, for 123 Years, which Years (counted from the first of *Cyrus*) end in the 11th of *Darius Notbus*. See *Connect.* p. 411. Now supposing that *Jozadak* might die about 16 Years before the Release of the *Jews*, then *Jeshua* might hold the Office for 36 or 37 Years from the first of *Cyrus*, and he might die about the 21st of *Darius Hyst.* And *Joiakim* might die about the 16th or 17th of

Xerxes. And then *Eliashib* would die about the 35th of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*. Then *Eliashib* would be living in the 32^d of *Artaxerxes*, when *Nehemiah* went into *Persia*, and might settle *Tobiah* in a Chamber of the Temple in *Nehemiah's* Absence, c. xiii. 6. and he might die, and *Joiada* succeed him in the Office about 2 Years before *Nehemiah* return'd from *Persia*; and *Joiada* might continue *Tobiah* in the Temple, and might marry his Son *Manasseh* to the Daughter of *Sanballat* before *Nehemiah* returned to *Jerusalem*. And as to the Words c. xiii. 7. *Trem.* and *Jun.* render 'em, *Quod fecerat Eliashib*, which imply no Necessity to suppose that he was living when *Nehemiah* returned from *Persia*. Now by this reckoning, there may be an Agreement conceived between the History of *Neb.* and the *Chronicon Alex.* and *Josephus*: And the Ages of these High Priests may be brought to be within the Bounds of Credit; for 'tis possible that that *Johanan Son of Eliashib*, *Ez.* x. 6. might not be the Son of *Joiada*, but one of the younger Sons of *Eliashib*, or perhaps a Son of some other *Eliashib*. This Reckoning (if the *Chronicon Alex.* must be credited) will not allow *Jaddua* to have been High Priest in the Time of *Alexander*, as *Josephus* says, for by this Account *Jaddua* would be dead about 6 Years before the Time that *Alexander* came to *Jerusalem*. But 'tis plain that there is no Necessity, from *Josephus*, to suppose it was *Jaddua* that met *Alexander* on his Approach to *Jerusalem*: *Josephus* took it that the last *Darius* mentioned in Scripture (*Neb.* xii. 22.) was the *Darius* whom *Alexander* conquered, i. e. *Codomannus*, and so it is; but then he supposed that *Nehemiah* had himself mentioned this *Darius* as King of *Persia*, and *Jaddua* as High Priest of the *Jews*, whereas that could

could not be (of which more will be said by and by.) And so *Josephus* has made *Manasseh*, *Sanballat*, and *Jaddua* contemporary with the *Darius* whom *Alexander* conquered. As this could not possibly be, in the Case of the two former, so there is no Necessity to suppose that *Jaddua* was then living, for he might be dead, and *Onias* might be High Priest in the Time of *Darius Codomannus* and *Alexander*. And as there is no Necessity, from *Josephus*, to suppose that *Jaddua* was contemporary with *Darius Codomannus*, so I should something question whether that interpolated Place, *Neb. xii. 22.* does make them contemporary, as *Dr. P. p. 299.* seems to think. The Meaning of that Place may, I think, be taken thus, viz. *The Levites were recorded in the Days of Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua. Also, the Priests (in the Days of Eliashib, &c. and farther, viz.) to the Reign of Darius.*

But there lies no such Objection against *Josephus's* Testimony, that *Manasseh* was chased away by *Nebemiah* in the Reign of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, for this is very consistent with, and agreeable to, the genuine Writing of *Nebemiah*, c. xiii.

Tho' it must indeed be allowed that *Josephus* does here confound the History of *Artaxerxes Longimanus* with that of *Artaxerxes Mnemon*. But then, what is much to the same Purpose, he says, (*Ant. l. xi. c. 5.*) that *Joiakim* died in the Reign of *Xerxes*, whereas *Dr. P.* sets his Death in the 12th of his Son *Artaxerxes*, which adds a great Probability to what was before suppos'd, viz. that the Years of *Jeshua's* High Priesthood are to be counted from the Time of his Father's Death.

Josephus, as some say, has said (but it is not in an *Eng. Edition* that I have) that the High Priest who met *Alexander*, was then an ancient white-

hair'd Man. If the Case were so, yet *Onias* may be supposed to be an old Man at that time. For as *Manasseh* was married before the Death of *Artax. Longim. Neb. xiii. 28.* So his elder Brother *Johanan* might then be married, and his Son *Jad-dua* might then be born, about 4287. and *Jad-dua's* Son *Onias* might be born about 4307 or 8. and he would be about 75 when *Alexander* came to *Jerusalem*, 4382.

Sir *Isaac Newton* did indeed say that *Nebemiab* continued Governor of *Judea* to the Time of *Darius Notbus*, and in his *Chronicle*, has made his Office to end about the 12th of *Darius*. But this was occasioned by his not observing that there must have been an Interpolation in *Neb. xii.* for he, taking all that is said in this Chapter, to be *Nebemiab's* own writing, supposed (p. 363.) that the *Darius* there mentioned, was *Darius Notbus*, and thence concluded (p. 373.) that *Nebemiab* continued to his Time. Dr. *Prid.* p. 301. &c. has shewn that great part of *Neb. xii.* must have been an Interpolation inserted (by *Simon Justus*, &c.) many Years after the Death of *Nebemiab*, and that the *Darius* there mentioned, was *Darius Codomannus*. And it can't well be conceived to be otherwise, for as *Elia-shib* was High Priest for about 15 Years in *Nebemiab's* Time, it can hardly be thought that he should continue Governor thro' a Succession of three more High Priests. As Sir *Isaac* had concluded that the Expulsion of *Manasseh* (with the Relation of which, *Nebemiab* concluded his History) was in the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, it would not be reasonable to think that he should continue in his Office for 12 or 15 Years more, and yet add nothing more to his History. What Sir *Isaac* says, p. 42. shews that he found some Difficulty in this Case; for *Johanan* could not possibly be High Priest at the

the Death of *Nebemiab*, provided he himself had said, *In the Days of—Johanan and Jaddua.*

Whether *Nebemiab* might die a little before *Artaxerxes*, or whether he surviv'd him, and might not be continued in his Office by the next Successors, is not, I suppose, now to be known: But which ever it was, it seems pretty plain that his History don't reach below the Death of *Artaxerxes*. So that there seems little Ground, from the Writings of *Ezra* and *Nebemiab*, whereon to build any such figurative Interpretation of those Words in the Prophecy, for they seem to have continued in their Office, successively, but little more than 30 Years.

Another Reason that the Doctor gives against taking those Words of the Prophecy in a literal Sense, is to this Effect, *viz. p. 287. 288. 368.*

“ That if the 70 Weeks be dated from the time
“ of *Nebemiab*, (when a Command went forth
“ for building *Jerusalem* in a literal Sense) this
“ can't comport with the whole Meaning of the
“ Prophecy, because that had foretold that *Je-*
“ *rusalem* should be 49 Years in building, but
“ *Jerusalem* was rebuilt (by which, he means, I
“ think, totally rebuilt, See *p. 368.*) in much
“ less time than this, after the Commission that
“ was granted by *Artaxerxes* to *Nebemiab*.”

This is the Substance of the Doctor's arguing in this Case, only he would not go so far as to allow that *Nebemiab* had a Commission for building the City. He says, *p. 287.* “ Tho' *Nebemiab*
“ did much enlarge *Jerusalem*, by bringing new
“ Colonies of the *Jews* thither—yet this enlarg-
“ ing of the City can't be called, the restoring
“ and rebuilding of it, for it was restored and
“ rebuilt long before, and had many Streets and
“ ciled Houses again erected in it, by virtue of
“ the

“ the Decree granted by *Cyrus*.—And after that,
 “ from time to time, many more were added to
 “ them by virtue of the same Decree confirmed
 “ by *Darius Hystaspis*, many Years before *Nebemiab*, &c.” Concerning *Cyrus’s* Decree, and what was said by *Haggai*, c. i. 4. enough has been said, but who can think that *Darius Hyst.* added any Houses to the City? For his Decree related peculiarly to the Temple, as every one will see who reads *Ez.* c. v, vi. And, that *Jerusalem* was restored and rebuilt long before *Nebemiab* came to it, the bare reading of *Neb.* ii. 3, 4, 5. and vii. 4. will confute any such Notion.

The Doctor utterly mistook the Case, with regard to *Nebemiab’s* Commission. He says, p. 363. “ *Nebemiab* had, in that Commission, by an express Clause therein inserted, full Authority given him to repair the Walls, and set up the Gates of *Jerusalem*. And p. 365. a royal Decree was issued out for rebuilding the Walls and Gates, &c.” And p. 367. “ The building of the Walls of *Jerusalem* being all for which he prayed his first Commission, &c.

Nebemiab, c. ii. in his Request to the King, did indeed say, v. 3. *the Gates thereof are consumed with Fire*. But he first said, *The City, the Place of my Father’s Sepulchres, lieth waste*. And v. 5. *That thou wouldest send me unto Judah, unto the City, &c.—that I may build it, &c.—So it pleased the King to send me*. There is no need for supposing that he had a Clause in his Commission for building the Walls and Gates, since it appears that he had a full Commission for building the City, of which, the Walls were a Part. When he had got a Grant of this Commission, he did indeed pray the King for Letters to the Keeper of his Forest, to allow him Timber for building the Walls,

Walls, &c. because he knew, no doubt, that those were the Parts which he should first build.

And so the Doctor, p. 367. supposes that as soon as the Walls were built (which he says, p. 366. were finished in 52 Days) *Nebemiah* return'd to the King for new Orders for what he was farther to do. The Doctor had soon dispatch'd the Walls. Were the Walls of *Jerusalem* to be now rebuilt, they might be troubled to find Hands enough to finish 'em in 52 Days, were no Oppositions to be made. And 7 or 8 of those 52 must have been Sabbaths. The Words of *Neb. c. vi. 1--15.* seem to mean no more than that it was the finishing part (the setting the Doors on the Gates) that was finished in 52 Days. So Sir *Isaac Newton* takes it. It can't be thought that he could get to *Jerusalem* time enough to set about the Walls, 52 Days before the 25th of *Elul* (the 6th Month) i. e. by the Beginning of the 4th Month. It was in the first Month that he first asked leave to be sent up, and 'twas, no doubt, a considerable time before he could be prepared to set out, and the Journey would take up some Months, and some little time must be spent at *Jerusalem* before they could set about the Work. So that 'tis pretty plain that the Walls were not finished in the same Year that he came to *Jerusalem*. Sir *Isaac Newton*, *Chron. p. 372.* cites *Joseph. Antiq. l. xi. c. 5.* saying, that the Walls were finished in the 28th Year of *Artaxerxes*. And tho' *Josephus* made some Mistakes in this Part of the History, yet this seems not an improbable Account, for it must be the 21st of *Artaxerxes* when the Walls were begun, and as they met with powerful Oppositions, 'tis very likely that it might be 7 Years before the Walls were finished.

The

The Doctor seems to be mistaken in thinking that *Nehemiah* went twice back to *Persia*. His chief Reason for this (besides his thinking that the Walls were finish'd in 52 Days) is, because he had set the King a Time in which he would return. This the Doctor thinks must be some short Time, and not that at 12 Years end, c. xiii. 6. Now whatever may be thought of 12 Years being too long a Time for him to ask for being at *Jerusalem*, 'tis sure that 2 Months will be thought too short. 'Tis not improbable that *Nehemiah*, considering the Work he was going about might ask the King to allow him 12 Years unless it may be thought that, finding the Work greater than he expected, and many Oppositions, he might send to the King to lengthen his Time. See c. xi. 24. Neither does it seem to have been an absolute Command, laid on him to return at any set time, as Doctor P. says, but, that he had promised the King to return at a set Time. His other Reason, *i. e.* because *Nehem.* c. vii. 2. appointed Deputies, has little in it; for if it were supposed that he had appointed Deputies during any first and shorter Absence, then surely he would have the more Reason to appoint some during his second and longer Absence. Therefore as the appointing Deputies and the Return to *Persia* are each but once mention'd, 'tis most probable that he went but once, and that these Deputies were then appointed, *i. e.* When the Walls were finished, he gave these Men the Charge of the Gates of the City, while he took some Respite after a long and laborious Fatigue in overseeing the Work of the Walls; and also, while he set himself to regulate some other Affairs, of which 'tis probable that the building of the Governor's House was one thing, c. ii. 8. for this seems not to have been done

It does not appear from the History of *Nebe-miab*, how far a Progress was made in the Buildings of the City during his Time, only one may judge, by the Account he gives, that it could not be near finished. He says, c. vii. 4. *The City was spacious, but the People few therein, and the House unbuilt.* This was after the Walls were built. And tho' he did, sometime after this, (c. xi.) gather more People into the City, in order, no doubt, to get more Houses built, yet as he seems not to have held his Office above 3 or 4 Years longer, and was also absent a good part of the time before this, (for this was after his Return from *Persia* as will be hereafter shewn) there is, I think little room to suppose that it could be near finished in his time, and it must be thought that some Parts of it remained unbuilt at the Death of *Artaxerxes*. And as the *Old Testament* History does not go down any lower, and as there is, it seems, no other History left, to give any Account of it, therefore there can no certain Account be had of the Time when it was finishd. Only these Circumstances may be observed, viz. 1st. That the City could not be finished before the Death of *Artaxerxes*. 2^{dly}. That *Manasseh* was chased away by *Nebe-miab* sometime toward the End of *Artaxerxes's* Reign; and he then fled into *Samaria*, to his Father-in-law *Sanballat*. 3^{dly}, That (as all, I think, do allow) the Temple on Mount *Gerizim* was built in the Reign of *Darius Notbus*. See *Newton's Chronicle*. He sets the Beginning of this Temple in the second of *Darius*. Now this makes it a

probable

probable Case, that soon after *Darius* was settled on the Throne (which was about 8 Months after his Father's Death) *Sanballat* might address him for leave to build this Temple: And this makes it not improbable that this King was, from the first, no Favourer of the *Jews*, and therefore whatever part of the City remained unbuilt at the Death of *Artaxerxes*, might either totally cease building, or go on very slowly all this Reign, for 'tis not likely that the *Jews* could make much Progress in it without the Leave and Favour of the King: And the Allowance of Materials, &c. which had before been granted to them, might now be given to the *Samaritans* for building their Temple. Now 'tis not improbable (at least there seems nothing to the contrary but) that the next King, *Artaxerxes Mnemon* might encourage the *Jews* in building their City, and, that it might then be finished in a few Years. *Plutarch* (in vit. *Artax. Mn.*) tho' he does not mention any thing of his dealing by the *Jews*, yet says of him in general, that he was (at least all the first of his Reign) a Prince of Mildness, Clemency, &c. gave easy Audience to Suitors, and, that he followed the first *Artaxerxes* (from whom he had his Name) in Goodness and Courtesy. Tho' there be nothing very material to be gathered from hence, in relation to the Matter in hand, yet 'tis sure that the *Jews* might have an equitable Plea for having their City thoroughly rebuilt, and they would not fail to represent to him, the Decree of his Grand-father for that Purpose: and 'tis possible that this King might have more respect for, and more endeavour to imitate, his Grand-father than his Father, and so, might favour the Solicitations of the *Jews* more than of the *Samaritans*. Seven Weeks of Lunar Years from the Time that *Nebemiah* came to

to *Jerusalem* would end about the 8th of *Artax. Mnem.*

The Prophecy seems to have predicted that there would be two several Periods in the Building ; for otherwise it would very probably have been expressed in one Word. For *Streets* and *Ditches* (or, void Places) seem to be (in other Words) *the whole City*. *Streets*, to mean, the Walls and other of the principal Buildings, Houses, &c. which together would compose the chief Streets. And, *void Places*, the Remainder of the City.

Dr. *Prid.* p. 368. has brought a Passage from *Herodotus*, by which he would seem to prove that the City was finished long before the Time here suppos'd. He here says, "*Herodotus*, who travelled thro' *Judea* a little after this Time doth, in the Description which he gives us of it ; (*Jerusalem*) compare it to *Sardis*, &c." The Doctor here says, *a little after this Time*, i. e. the time that *Nebemiah* came to *Jerusalem*: for tho' he makes this to be *Nebemiah's* 2d Year, yet it was really his first, for he went up *An.* 444. as was before shewn. He says himself, p. 57. that it was about 12 Years after this Time that *Herodotus* wrote his History wherein he gives this Description of *Jerusalem*. But whoever reads what the Doctor has said concerning this Matter, p. 369. will see that it might be a great many, perhaps near 30 Years after the Time that *Nebemiah* came to *Jerusalem*, when *Herodotus* saw it, and 'tis probable that by that time the Buildings might be in a good Forwardness. And then, as to the saying of *Herodotus*, any one may perceive that that might be spoken only with regard to the Extent and Model of the City, when perhaps several parts of it, especially of the meaner Houses, might be then

unbuilt: and there might be *Ditches* (or void Places) still remaining. As if any Foreigner had seen *London* when it was about $\frac{1}{4}$ rebuilt after the Fire, he might well enough say, that *London* was a large handsome City, like to *Paris*, &c.

The first Step in this Explanation, *i. e.* the putting of a figurative Sense on those Words in the Prophecy, seems manifestly to be an injudicious Conjecture; for who can, with Reason, suppose, that in one part of the Prophecy, the Word *Jerusalem*, should figuratively signify, *The Political and Ecclesiastical State of the Jews*. And that in other Parts of it, the Word, *City, Holy City*, should literally signify, *The City*. According to such an Explanation, the first Words in the Prophecy would run thus, *viz. Seventy Weeks are determined upon thy People, and upon the Political and Ecclesiastical State of thy People*.

And as it is a *groundless*, so also is it an *inconvenient*, Hypothesis; for tho' it be of no great Moment, as to those Words which he has figuratively explained, whether they were delivered in a literal, or a figurative Sense; yet this may give a Handle to licentious Men to say, that other parts of it may be taken in the same figurative or allegorical Sense. It is certainly the most rational and safe Way, always to take the Words of Scripture in a plain, proper, and literal Sense, unless where the plain Meaning of the Text and Context, or some other Circumstances, do evidently shew that they cannot so be taken.

Now as the foremention'd Observations (together with one to be mention'd by and by;) will, I think, pretty plainly shew that Dr. *Prideaux's* Method of computing these Weeks, can't consist with Reason and Truth; so it will, I think, plainly appear that those two other very learned
Men

Men (cited by Dr. P. p. 283.) *i. e.* *Petavius*, and Arch-bishop *Usher*, were mistaken in their Computation. They did, it seems, both remove the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, 9 Years back from the Time where 'tis commonly placed; *Petavius*, by making him to reign 9 Years in consortship with his Father *Xerxes*; and *Usher*, by setting the Death of *Xerxes* 9 Years sooner than almost all others have done.

Now in this they go contrary to the whole Body of Chronologers. Besides, could this be allowed, and, that the Canon of *Ptolemy*, and all other Authorities must give place to one Instance taken from *Tbucydides*, yet this would be far from answering the Purpose; for the Time would still be too short by 5 Years, for as the true 20th Year of *Artaxerxes* (*i. e.* that part of it in which *Nebemiab* had his Commission for rebuilding) was in *An. Per. Jul.* 4270. therefore, by their reckoning, it must have been *Ann.* 4261. From whence, to the Time of Christ's Passion, there were but 485 Years. They were so far in the right, as, to date the 70 Weeks from the Time of *Nebemiab*, when, and when only, there went forth a Command to restore and build *Jerusalem*: But it might be seen that there was no reconciling of the Time to solar Years.

This Mistake of Arch-bishop *Usher* was, I suppose, the Occasion of a wrong Date being set in the *Eng. Margin*; for in *Ez. vi.* over against *Darii* 6. the Date is 3489. which is, I think, the true Date, *i. e.* by the *Heb. Copy*: But in c. vii. over against *Artax.* 7. the Date is 3537. which makes a Distance of 48 Years, but the true Distance was 57 or 58; for *Darius* reigned 36 Years, *Xerxes* 21. But, as Dr. P. says, the Bishop was obliged to contract the Reign of *Xerxes* to 12 Years,

Years, and to add the remaining 9, to that of his Son.

Before we go to compute 490 Lunar Years back from the Time of CHRIST's Passion, in order to see how well this Command going forth for building *Jerusalem* in the Time of *Nebemiah*, will suit for the Date of the 70 Weeks, it may not be amiss to look back a little on that Attempt to build the City, before-mention'd, *i. e.* by *Ezra*, &c. Because it may, by some, be objected, That this was the first Command that went forth for building *Jerusalem*. But I think there is no room for such a Supposition in this case, for this can't properly be accounted any Command, or Word, going forth for, &c. It can't be said to be any Command going forth from the King, because 'tis plain that he had then given no leave for it. Nor can it properly be called any Command from *Ezra*, because he had no Commission for it: Neither does *Ezra* seem to have been made *Tirshatha*, as *Nebemiah* was, and perhaps it was not lawful for a Priest to take that Office: He was indeed impowered to set Magistrates, &c. but perhaps only in Matters Ecclesiastic; however that be, when he had had a large Donation for the Service of the Temple, &c. with a Liberty to do with the rest of the Silver and Gold as should seem good unto them (v. 18.) it should seem that they thought themselves enabled to begin building the City. So that it seems to have been a joint Attempt by *Ezra* and those who went up with him (c. iv. 12.) in conjunction with the rest of the *Jews*, without any particular Command from any one: And this Attempt was quashed as soon as they had set up the Walls, and begun to build the City. Providence interpos'd, for the Time for the Commencement of the 70 Weeks was not yet

yet fully come, and if they had been now suffer'd to go forward with the Building, and had had Power to go thro' with it, there would have been no need for a Command to have been given out afterwards for the building of *Jerusalem*. But in some Years afterwards the Case was otherwise. *Nehemiah* asked and obtained a full Commission from this King for rebuilding the City, and was made *Tirshatha* of *Judæa* for that Purpose, and probably did, when he came to *Jerusalem*, issue out a Proclamation in form for the rebuilding, and for the People to repair to him, to assist in the building.

Now as for the Time of this Command going forth, we can't, at this Distance, come to know it exactly to a few Months, but it will appear very probable that it was very few, if any, Months over or under 490 lunar Years before the Death of CHRIST. *Nehemiah*, c. ii. says, that in the Month *Nisan*, in the 20th Year of *Artaxerxes*, he pray'd leave of the King to be sent up to *Jerusalem* to build it, which was granted. It was before shewn that *Nisan Artax. 7.* was *April An. Per. Jul. 4257.* therefore *Nisan. Artax. 20.* was *April 4270.* which was just 476. Years before *April 4746.* And these 476 Solar Years, being converted into Lunar Years, they make 490 Years and about 8 Months. It seems very reasonable to suppose that the 70 Weeks were not to take Date from the Time when he ask'd, or got, this Commission from *Artaxerxes* (of which Time Multitudes of the *Jews*, &c. might be ignorant) but from the Time when he first came to *Jerusalem*, and there gave out the Word for rebuilding. Now, how long a Space there might be, between the Time of his first asking this Commission, and of his coming to *Jerusalem*, can only be conjectured. There is a Necessity to suppose that some Months were spent in

in getting the Decree to be passed, Letters to be signed by the King, a Troop of Horse to go with him, Preparations for the Journey, &c. and then the Journey, which would, itself, take up some Months. 'Tis probable that he was at *Shushan* when he got this Grant, for he was there a few Months before, (c. i. 1.) *Ezra* made 4 Months in going up from *Babylon*; and tho' he did stop a while by the Way, yet *Shushan* is at so much greater Distance from *Jerusalem* than *Babylon* is, that if *Nebemiah* made no quicker travelling than *Ezra* did, he must be above 4 Months on his Journey.

'Tis plain by the History that *Nebemiah* made this Request on the first Day that his Turn came to attend on the King as Cup-bearer, after he had about 4 Months before been inform'd of the desolate State of his City and People; and tho' the King did then grant his Request, yet 'tis probable he would be obliged to continue his usual Time of Attendance, before he could be dismissed, and before he could make the necessary Preparations for his Journey; and how long time this might take up, is uncertain, according to what Number of Servants were retained in that Office. A Month is the least that can well be supposed; it might be more.

Sir *Isaac Newton*, *Chronol.* p. 371. has, I think, so spoken as if he supposed *Nebemiah* to have got to *Jerusalem* within the 20th Year of *Artaxerxes*, if his Words must be so taken, which are, *In the 20th Year of the King, Nehemiah bearing, &c. obtained leave of the King, to go and build the City, and the Governor's House, and coming to Jerusalem in the same Year, continued Governor 12 Years, &c.* If it be meant that he came *Jerusalem*, in the same Julian Year, it might probably be so: But if it

be

be meant, in the same 20th Year of the King, it seems not very probable. If Sir Isaac's Meaning be so to be taken, any one may perceive that he spoke this in a cursory Way, not minding here any exact Preciseness of Time. There is indeed one Place in *Nebemiah* which may seem a little to favour this Opinion, viz. c. v. 14. But I think there is no Necessity so to take it. Putting the Case, that some Man in *England* had been made Governor of some Colony in *America*, by King *Charles II.* toward the latter part of his 20th Year, and that after about 8 Months being spent, in Preparations, Voyage, &c. he came to take Charge of the People. When he had been several Years among 'em, he might well enough say, as *Nebemiah* here did. *From the Time that I was appointed to be their Governor—from the 20th even unto the 32^d Year of the King, i. e. 12 Years, I and my, &c. Nebemiah* was doubtless appointed Governor in the King's 20th Year, tho' perhaps it might be a few Months within his 21st Year when he came to *Jerusalem*. By Sir Isaac's Calculation of the Time when this King began his Reign, it was a Month or two before the Autumnal Equinox. By what I before observed, this should seem a small Matter too early. However, it might be at the end of *August* or beginning of *September*. It was in *Nisan* (suppose a Week in *April*) when he first made this Request: So that here was but 5 or 6 Months from this Time, to the Expiration of his 20th Year. Four or five Months the Journey might take up, and no one can reasonably suppose but that above a Month would be spent before he set out, for such Affairs are not used to be very expeditiously brought to pass in great Prince's Courts. And if there be no Necessity for supposing that he came within the

F

King's

King's 20th Year, then the Case is altogether uncertain, and some Delays more than were barely necessary, might protract his coming to near the End of this Year 4270. and from the latter end of this Year, to the Time of Christ's Passion, there were much about 70 Weeks of Lunar Years: And then from *Nehemiab* (being constituted Governor of *Judæa*, with a Commission for rebuilding *Jerusalem*) went forth That *Command to restore and build Jerusalem*, foretold by the Prophecy.

N. B. Besides that it may well enough be supposed that eight Months might have passed between his asking the Commission, and his coming to *Jerusalem*; so also there might be an accidental Circumstance or two which might bring this Time still a Month nearer. For

1. It might be about the End of *Nisan* when he made this Request. Christ's Passion was on the 14th of *Nisan*.

2. It might be an intercalated Year, and then the Month *Nisan* would fall some Weeks later in this Year than it did in 4746.

For a farther Confirmation of what has been said, I will add one Circumstance more (not taken notice of by Dr. *Prideaux*. Whether by others, I know not) which is, I think, of considerable Weight, for shewing that the 70 Weeks are not to be computed by Solar Years.

It is, no doubt, by almost all supposed, that the last of the 70 Weeks was to commence with the Preaching of *John Baptist*, and to end at the Death of Christ. Now supposing that there were a few Months over in the whole 70 Weeks, (which is far from certain) yet 'tis very probable that in this last one Week, there was very little, if any, time over, or under, 7 Years. And as
the

the Time of our blessed Saviour's Passion is known to a Day (*Apr. 3. 4746.*) then it may well be supposed that *John* began his Preaching, &c. much about 7 Years before this Time. So that they who would have the Time computed by Solar Years, must, I think, suppose that *John* entered on his Ministry about the beginning of *April 4739.* And yet there is good reason to suppose, that the 15th Year of *Tiberius* (in which Year *John* began his Preaching, *Luc. iii. 1.*) did not begin so soon by some Months; (and how soon within his 15th Year *John* began his Preaching is not known.) For as the *Roman* Historians do say that *Tiberius* was taken into Consortship with *Augustus* in governing the Provinces (which is undoubtedly the *Epocha* by which *St. Luc.* reckoned) for two Years before the Death of *Augustus*, which was *Aug. 19. 4727.* (*Connect. p. 298.* and *Dr. Wall* on *Luc. iii. 1.* and in *Def. p. 295.*) Then it may be supposed that the 15th Year of *Tiberius* began sometime in, or about *Aug. 4739.* For seldom any Historian passes over any considerable Space of Time, in accounting only for 2 or 3 Years, without taking notice of it. Had *Tiberius* begun to govern the Provinces for 2 Years and an half, or more, before *Augustus* died, they would probably have said, 2 Years and an half, or, near 3 Years.

There is also another Circumstance proper to be considered in this Case, viz. concerning the Time when *Pilate* became Governor of *Judæa*, for he was so at the Calling of *John*, *Luc. iii. 1.* Now *Josephus* has, it seems, said that *Pilate* continued Governor for ten Years, and that he being sent for by *Tiberius*, to answer for his Crimes, *Tiberius* (who died *March 16. 4750.*) was dead before *Pilate* arrived at *Rome.* See *Joseph. Antiq.*

fig. l. xviii. c. 5. and Dr. Wall's Def. p. 297. The Doctor does here (in answer to Dr. Allix, who had thought that *Pilate* could not enter on his Office so soon as 4739.) say that the ten Years in *Josephus* need not be taken so precisely as not to admit of 6 or 7 Months over. And (from Archbishop *Usher*) that the sailing to *Rome* in that Winter time might be more than 3 Months. If the Case were so (and this seems to be as much as can well be allowed) *i. e.* That *Pilate* entered on his Office about ten Years and ten Months before *Tiberius's* Death, yet then, his Government would not begin before the middle of *May* 4739. Of the two, there seems more Difficulty in supposing this last Week to have been so much as 7 Lunar Years, than in thinking that it could not be so much as 7 Solar Years. It is possible that *Pilate* might enter on his Office near about the forementioned time. And it is also possible that *Tiberius* might not begin his Government so precisely for two Years before the Death of *Augustus*, but that there may be supposed an Allowance of 2 or 3 Months over. And then, if the Calling of *John* was a very little time within the first Year of *Pilate*, and the 15th of *Tiberius* (which might be, since there are no Reasons to the contrary.) Then this last Week might be about 7 Lunar Years, the beginning of which would fall a little after the middle of *June* 4739.

Dr. *Prideaux*, at the end of his History, as he makes *John* to begin his Preaching at the Passover *A. D.* 26. so he supposes that Christ began his Ministry at the Feast of Tabernacles, *A. D.* 29. And, referring to *Matt.* iv. 12. he says, that *John* was then imprisoned, which cannot be, since it appears from *St. John* c. iii. that *John* was not imprisoned till a considerable

derable Time after Christ had entered on his Ministry. I am of the Doctor's Opinion that Christ began his Ministry *A. D.* 29. (tho' probably something later than he supposes) but not that *John* was then imprisoned. I am also of his Opinion that *St. Matthew*, when he says (*c. iv. 17.*) *From that Time Jesus began to preach,* &c. does here refer to the Time when Christ began his Ministry. But how it comes to be here (and *Marc i. 14.*) said that *John* was then imprisoned, since there is great Difficulty in reconciling this Account with that of *St. John*; and as the Doctor (nor any other that I have seen) does not give any satisfactory Account in this Matter, I will say what seems to me most reasonable under another Head, when I come to speak of the Time of *John's* Imprisonment; and will here only remark, That so far as concerns this Prophecy, there is no need for supposing that *John* gave over his Preaching before Christ entered on his Ministry.

These Observations are humbly proposed and submitted to the Judgment of the learned Reader, whether it may be thought reasonable to forsake the antient Method used by *Africanus*, &c. (see *Connect.* p. 280.) i. e. in computing of the 70 Weeks by Lunar Years. As this Method had been begun by *Africanus* 1500 Years ago, 'tis, I think, some pity that learned Men in future Ages should forsake him herein (and make that Mischief of a variety of Opinions in a Case of this Importance) unless they could propose a more rational Method: which, whether the fore-said learned Men have done, is, as was said, submitted to the learned Reader, from the foregoing, and any other Observations which he will be able to make.

I own

I own my self an utter Stranger to the *Hebrew* Language, and therefore what little I shall say farther on this Head, *viz.* with respect to the Meaning of a Word or two in this Prophecy, can be but partly by Conjecture, *i. e.* from the foregoing Circumstances, and, by observing the several Opinions of Translators and other learned Men about the Meaning of them. This can be of no Use to a learned Reader, and any such may be pleased to pass it over.

The two Words which have the chief Influence on what has been here treated of, are, what are rendered by the *English* Translators, *Dan. ix. 24, 25.* [Determined] and [Wall]

Most of the modern Translators (except the *Vulgar*) do, I think, render the former of these Words by some Word of the same, or a like Signification with the *English*, *viz.* *Decided, Determinated, &c.* But the *Septuagint* (the earliest Translators of the *Heb.*) do, it seems, render it, *συμπεσπυγναι*, which does, I think, properly signify, *Contracted*. And *Vulgar, Abbreviate, Abbreviated*, which are both of one Sense. Dr. *Prideaux*, p. 281. says, it does signify *Determined, or Decided*. And I doubt not but that *Petavius* and *Usher* were of the same Opinion. But the Doctor here adds, that neither this *Hebrew* Word *Neehtac*, nor any other of that Root do any where else occur in the whole *Hebrew* Bible; but says, That this Word is used in the *Chaldee Paraphrase* on *Esth. iv. 5.* in the Sense of *Determined, &c.* and no where in any other. One would think that if it were of so plain and simple Signification, and of so common Use, it would have come in more than once in so large Writings. So far as I can learn by some who are well skilled in the *Hebrew* Language, they do

do say, that 'tis a something unusual Word; that it does, in its original, strict, and proper Meaning (so far as it can be rendered by one *English* Word) signify, *Cut*, i. e. cut off, or cut short. They do withal say, that the Rabbins do pretty constantly use the Word in much the same Sense as the *English* Word, *Appointed*. And that is indeed the Word in *Esth.* iv. 5.

By observing the forementioned Circumstances, and, by the various Opinions about the Meaning of this Word, one who knows not the *Hebrew* will be apt to conclude, that it must either signify *Cut*, or *Contracted*; or else, that it must be of such an extensive Signification, as to carry the Sense of both, i. e. *Abbreviando Determinate, Abbreviatedly Determined*. This can here be only conjectured, but it does sometimes so happen, that some Word in one Language is used in a more complicated Sense than any one Word in the Language into which it is to be translated. If that be the Case with this Word, then the *Vulgar* has kept in the full Meaning of the Original, and the *English*, &c. have lost one great part of it. For though the Word *Abbreviated* does not naturally in its Signification, carry any Sense of *Determined*, yet when 'tis so used, as in this Place, the Reader must then understand that Sense of it in his Mind: For to say, *70 Weeks are abbreviated upon*, &c. is all one as if it were said, *70 Weeks are abbreviatedly determined upon*, &c. Or, which is pretty much one, *70 Abbreviated Weeks are determined upon*, &c. But this may be only Conjecture. This Matter may perhaps be more easily and naturally accounted for in another manner. For

When I say that the *English*, &c. have dropt one part of the Sense of this Word, I mean,

only with regard to, and in compliance with, the common, and modern Acceptation of the Meaning of those Words; for there is not any doubt but that the Words *Determined* and *Decided*, are strictly and properly of the very same Signification, as is said to be the original Meaning of this *Hebrew* Word; for the Word *Determined* does strictly signify *Limited*; and *Decided*, *Cut off*, as their Originals do manifestly shew, viz. from *Cædo*, to *Cut*; and from *Termino*, to *Limit*. Now this is what naturally does happen, and always has happened, to all Languages, viz. that Time and Custom do often very much alter, and sometimes quite change the Use and Meaning of some Words; and this seems probably to have been the very Case, as to this *Hebrew* Word, viz. that it did originally and properly signify, *Cut off*, or *Cut short*; and, that at the Time when the LXX. Translation was made, they found that to be the proper, and (probably at that time, which seems to have been within 2 or 300 Years after this Prophecy was revealed to *Daniel*) the most common Use of the Word; but that in process of Time, the Rabbins (most of whose Writings now extant, are many Centuries below the LXX. Translation) came to use it in a Sense like our Word *Appointed*; much like what we have done with the Words *Determined* and *Decided*. But the sense of the Word is to be taken according to the original Meaning of it, and not according to the Sense that the modern Rabbins have put upon it.

By a diligent observing of the Words, as they lie in the Text, this Meaning does, I think, seem most naturally to arise from them, even though the Word *Determined* be taken in such a Sense as Dr. *Prideaux* and others have taken it.

For

For 'tis pretty plain that this Word is primarily and directly applied to the 70 Weeks ; *70 Weeks are determined*. Now in what Sense can this determining be taken, with regard to the 70 Weeks ? They must be supposed to be determined to some certain Period, and not to their full Length ; for if it were supposed that they were to run not only *ad tantum*, but *ad totum*, then they can't be properly said to be *Determined, Appointed, &c.* for they had before, and originally, been determined to their proper and natural Bounds. For when the *Jews* were first ordered to observe Sabbaths of Years, these were to be 7 Solar Years, *Exod. xxiii. Lev. xxv. Connect. p. 283.* therefore this must be some new and secondary Determination of these Weeks ; and then these Weeks being determined, are applied to the People, &c. *viz. 70 Weeks are determined upon thy People, and upon thy Holy City, to finish, &c. i. e. 70 determined or appointed Weeks are decreed, or ordained upon, &c. as the Time for the compleating of all those transcendent Events which here follow in the Context.* Had the Word *Determined* been primarily and peculiarly applied to the People, &c. it is probable that the Sentence would have begun with them, *viz. Thy People and thy Holy City are Determined, Appointed, Ordained, or Destinated; to the Time of 70 Weeks ;* or something like.

This Sense, I say, would seem most naturally to arise from the Words, even by taking the Word *Determined* according to the modern Acceptation of it. But if it be also considered, 1st, That the *lxx.* Translators, and the *Vulgar* have rendered *Nechtac* by Words that do manifestly signify, *Cut Short, Abbreviated, or Contracted*, and, that some modern learned Men do

say, that that is the most proper Signification of it ; and 2dly, That the Circumstances in this Case do seem to require such a Sense, because it would seem that no Computation of the 70 Weeks can well comport with the Prophecy, when compared with the Events which had there been predicted, but by counting by short Years: Therefore we (who know not the *Hebrew*) may, I think, very reasonably conclude, that the Word must be taken as the LXX. have rendered it.

I have, as I said, been informed by good Judges, that this *Hebrew* Word does signify *Cut* or *Contracted*, and doubt not but that any one who will please to examine, will find that it does grammatically so signify. And therefore I would humbly offer this Consideration to shew the reasonableness of taking it so here, viz. in such a solemn Prediction, which does not only, as other Prophecies, foretel the transcendent Effects of the Messiah's coming, but was also delivered to foreshew the very Time when he should come. In such a Case, how can it be thought that the Angel should use any Word (which was to be some Guide for directing them in the computing the Time) that was of a doubtful Signification? especially since that, if it were only intended to mean *Appointed*, &c: they doubtless had Words which did statedly signify that and nothing else ; so that there is great Reason to believe that this Word in *Daniel's* Time was never used to signify *Appointed*. And though it may be of Use in many Cases, in order to a right apprehending of the Words in the *Hebrew* Scriptures, to observe how the *Jewish* Writers do use the same Words, Phrases, &c. yet this can't be an universal Rule, especially since their Writings are so far below the Scripture times, and especially

especially in the Case of such a Word, which, as we find by Experience, is naturally apt to have its Meaning changed by Time. Our Word *Determined* did, no doubt, in the Infancy of our Language, use to signify *Limited*, but we do now (though not in all Cases) use it in a different Sense; and the Steps of such a Transition are easy; for from *Limiting*, it might come in an Age or two to be used to signify *Fixing*, or *Stating* any thing, as to Time, Space, Number, &c. and then, *To Appoint*, *Purpose*, &c. for all Languages (as Dr. *Prideaux Connect.* p. 218. says) being in *Fluxu*, and the earliest *Jewish* Writings extant being near 700 Years below *Daniel's* Time, many Changes might happen in the use of some Words in such a Space of Time. And I doubt not but that the forsaking of the original Meaning of this Word, as rendered by the LXX. and adhering too strictly to that Sense in which the modern *Jews* have used it, has been one principal Cause of leading our learned Moderns into such various and erroneous Opinions concerning the Nature of these 70 Weeks: Partly this, and partly by mistaking the Year in which *Nebemiah* went up to rebuild *Jerusalem*, which seems, I think, not to have been observed by any one before Sir *Isaac Newton*.

Dr. *Prideaux* (p. 2. l. 8.) does indeed plead for the Antiquity of some *Jewish* Writings, as having been composed about our Saviour's Time. But if the Case be so, yet this was above 500 Years below *Daniel's* Time; neither does it plainly appear that there are any of so early a Date. And as to that Paraphrase on *Esther*, out of which the Doctor has given an Instance of the Use of this Word, that, it seems, is of a much later Date.

N. B. Although it be sufficient in this Case, that the *Hebrew* Word itself (*Nechtac*) did originally signify *Cut off*, or, *Abbreviated*, yet because some modern Rabbies have used this Word to signify, *Appointed*; and as I had intimated that this Word (as well as some Words in other Languages of the like Signification) had by a long course of Time been changed in the Signification and Use of it; and that we ought rather to regard the LXX. Translation in this Case, than the modern Rabbies: So I conceive that some Objections may be raised against the LXX. Translation in this Matter, with regard to the Antiquity of it; because though (as most learned Men do suppose) the greatest part of the *Greek* Translation (called the LXX. Translation) of the Old Testament, was made 2 or 300 Years before our Saviour's Time, yet, that the LXX. Translation of this Book of *Daniel* (at whatever Time it was first made) is lost, and that we have now no intire *Greek* Translation of it, earlier than that by *Theodotion* in the second Century after Christ.

Now in this Case it may be useful to observe, that *Tertullian* (*Adv. Judæos*) in his *Latin* Version of this Text, has the same Word [*Abbreviated*] as is now in the *Vulgar Latin*, which is supposed to have been afterward made by *St. Hierom*. And (as a late learned Person observes) it must be supposed that *Tertullian* took his Translation of this Text from the old *Vulgat*, or *Italic*, which had been taken from the old LXX. and therefore there is no doubt but that the LXX. Translators had rendred this Word in the same way as *Theodotion*, *Tertullian*, *Hierom*, &c. have done.

As to any particular Method in which these
Years

Years were to be *cut off*, the Prophecy does not indeed give any Rule: Therefore that is to be sought for, by observing what sort of Method the *Jews* made use of in computing and keeping their Year. Now in this Matter, we need go no farther than to Dr. *Prideaux*, who in his *Preface* has given a very exact and judicious account of it, *viz.* that their Year was computed after a twofold manner, both with regard to the Moon, and also to the Sun, *i. e.* their common Year was a pure Lunar Year, consisting of 12 Months, each of 29 and 30 Days alternately. But as this was about 11 Days short of a Solar Year, therefore they did, every 2 or 3 Years, as occasion required, intercalate a Month at the end of their Year, and so made this a Year of 13 Months. This they did, in order to have their Festival Days to fall always near about the same Season of the Year, with regard to the Sun: Therefore as the Prophecy had declared that these 70 Weeks were to be Cut, Contracted, or Abbreviated Weeks; of what contracting can it be more properly understood, than of this contracted Year, which was then in use with the *Jews*? And therefore it is most reasonable to suppose that the 70 Weeks of Years are to be computed by such short Years as the *Jewish* common and short Years were, *i. e.* 490 Lunar Years, without any Intercalations.

Archbishop *Usher* had not, as it seems, (*Prid. in Pref.*) a true Conception of the *Jewish* Year, which might be no small reason to lead him into his mistaken Computation of the 70 Weeks. But Dr. *P.* has given convincing Reasons to shew that the Bishop was mistaken in his Opinion. For had the *Jews* observed a Year of exactly 365 Days, in little more than 100 Years time, their

their Festival Days would have fallen in different Seasons of the Year, from those in which they were bound by their Law to observe them.

The latter of these Words is more variously rendered by Translators, viz. by *Vulgar*, *Muri*, *Walls*; by *Eng. Wall*; by *Castalio*, *Ruinæ*, *Ruins*; by *Eng. Margin*, *Breach*, or *Ditch*; by *Trem.* and *Jun. Fossa*, *Ditch*. And *Arius Montanus* does (as I have been informed) render it by some Word that signifies a *Ditch*. And Dr. *Prideaux*, p. 287. says it does signify a *Ditch*.

By such various Opinions of the Meaning of this Word, and by the Sense of the Context, and other Circumstances, one who knows not the *Hebrew* would naturally conceive that it is a Word of an ambiguous Signification, which may perhaps have been often used to denote a *Ditch*; but then it is possible that it may also have been used sometimes to denote some other *Vacuity*, *Chasm*, *Gap*, or *Breach*, &c.

If the Word *Jerusalem* be to be taken literally to mean the City (of which few, I think, will doubt) then it will plainly follow that this Word (even though it do strictly signify *Ditch*) must be taken to mean, the Vacancies in the Buildings of the City, as a Ditch is a Vacuity in the Earth. Moreover, if the former Word be rightly rendered *Contracted* (of which the Circumstances agreeing thereto, and some good Translations having so rendered it, are a pretty plain Proof) then it is plain that the 70 Weeks are to be dated from the Time of *Nehemiah*, when a Command went forth for building *Jerusalem* in a literal Sense (for 70 short Weeks can no where else be dated, so as to comport with the Prophecy, in respect of the beginning and ending of them.) Then, I say, these Words,

Street

Street and *Ditch*, must be taken to mean some Parts (both of them together, I think, as was said, the whole) of the City; and therefore these Words can't be drawn into any such allegorical Sense as Dr. *Prideaux* has put on them. The Reader will see what the Doctor understood by *The Street and Ditch of Jerusalem*: And he may also see that what he cites, p. 289. from some *Jewish* Writings, in defence of his figurative Meaning of the Word *Ditch*, is a strong Argument to the contrary: for if the *Jews* did anciently always make use of the Word *Hedge* in denoting of such a figurative Fence, (and the Scripture does the same, *Job* i. 10, &c.) then 'tis some sign that the Word *Ditch* was never thus us'd by 'em.

The Translators do also promiscuously render these two latter Words, as to singular, or plural, and Dr. *Prid.* who keeps close to the Word *Ditch*, renders the other sometimes *Street*, sometimes *Streets*. *Castalio's* rendering [*Vici Ruinaeque*] would seem to suit the Sense very well, if the Original will bear it. 'Tis sure that too strict a rendering does sometimes spoil the Sense, as well as too licentious; only 'tis something difficult always to observe a *Medium*, especially in a Book of sacred Authority.

P. S. Having since I drew up the foresaid Remarks seen a Treatise on this Subject by the learned Mr. *Marshall*, and another by the learned Mr. *Lancaster*, I thought it not amiss to add a few Words, which will, I think, shew that both their Schemes in this Matter, are also groundless. A great part of Mr. *Marshall's* Book is employed to shew the Error of Dr. *Prideaux*; and as to his Arguments for shewing the Doctor's Error in taking any Words of the Prophecy in a figurative Sense, I shall

shall not meddle with 'em, having spoken of that Matter before; the Reader may see several of the same which I had brought, only he also mistook the Sense of *Ezra*, c. iv. and of *Neb.* c. vi. and also misreckoned the Time by one Year, in the same manner as (was before shewn) Dr. P. had done. But as to what he says concerning the ending of the 70 Weeks, and of the Nature of the Years by which the Weeks were to be computed, his Reasons are, I think, utterly groundless: For 1. he mis-times the *Coming*, and the *Cutting off*, of Messiah, by fixing both in one point of Time, as if the Words, *unto Messiah*, were to signify, *unto the cutting off of Messiah*; whereas the Prophecy makes a plain Distinction between 'em; for it says, *unto Messiah* there will be seven and sixty two Weeks, and, *after 69 Weeks* Messiah will be cut off. Mr. M. has indeed made the *Coming* of Messiah, *i. e.* his *Coming* to be cut off, to fall 11 Months before he was cut off; this he thought would better suit with the Word *After*, then Dr. Prideaux's Meaning, *i. e.* one Week after the 69 Weeks. Now he says, p. 231. That *Nisan* was the Month in which *Nebemiab* had his Commission for rebuilding *Jerusalem*, and that the first Day of *Nisan* would generally fall on the 21st of *April*, and that *Apr.* 21. *Artax.* 20. would fall in the Year before CHRIST, 445, therefore *Daniel's* first Year beginning on *Ap.* 21. &c.—What an admirable Calculation is here? for

1. *Nisan* would generally begin in *March*, and tho' it would be continually shifting, yet it would generally begin in *March*, and sometimes in *April*, but not often, if ever, so late as the 21st.

2. It was in *Nisan* that *Nebemiab* first asked leave to build *Jerusalem*, and for Mr. M. to set this on
Nisan

Nisan 1. is merely arbitrary ; but supposing it was ; can any Man think that a Decree could be issued out upon the very Day that the Request was made ? and no one will suppose that the 70 Weeks were to commence till the Decree was passed.

3. The setting of *Nisan*, *Artax.* 20. in *An.* 445 is an Error, for the King's 20th Year begun about *September*, 445 and *Nisan* in his 20th Year, was in *An.* 444. So that supposing the Decree to go forth about the End of *April* 444, then according to his Computation, i. e. by a Year of 360 Days, the 69 Weeks would not end till above a Month after the Messiah was cut off. How well this will suit with the Word *After*, in the Prophecy, the Reader will judge.

2. He has disjoined the 70 Weeks, by making the last Period of one Week, not to commence till 30 Years after the Expiration of the 69 Weeks ; whereas when it had been said, *seventy Weeks are determined upon*, &c. any one would conclude that they were to be 70 current Weeks, without any void Space between any of the Periods.

3. His computing by a Year of 360 Days, can never consist with Reason, for who can think that in a Prophecy revealed to *Daniel*, and relating peculiarly to the *Jews*, the Time therein predicted, should be computed by any other Years than what were customary with the *Jews* ? And that the *Jews* used any such Year of 360 Days, he can give no tolerable Proof, see *Dr. Prid. Conn.* p. 283. and in *Pref.* As to what Mr. M. says, that there is no Account in Scripture of any such Year as Dr. P. here shews, 'tis little to the Purpose ; for as 'tis by almost all supposed that they did observe their Months by the *Phasis* of the Moon, therefore Reason will have it, that they

H

must

must make some Intercalations, in order to have their Festivals to fall in that Season of the Year (with regard to the Sun) as that their Lambs and their Barley might always be ready at the Passover: and so for other Festivals; and as Dr. *P.* has shewn that their early Writers do say that they did thus observe their Year (*i. e.* a Year of 12 Lunar Months, with an Addition of one Month every 2 or 3 Years) no one can reasonably doubt that that was their Method. And that this intercalary Month, the *Veadar*, does not happen to be mentioned in Scripture, is no Wonder, since there would generally be near 30 Months intervening between each *Veadar*. All that he has said, with any Shadow of Reason for such a Computation, is, that *Daniel* in another Prophecy, c. vii. 25. speaks of a *Time*, &c. and that this must be a Time or Year of 360 Days, because *St. John* in his *Apoc.* has explained it to be so. This must be allowed, but then can't any one see the Difference between these two Expressions, *viz.* a *Time*, and, a *Week*? A *Week* was a peculiar Reckoning with the *Jews*, the same as a *Sabbath*, and 70 Weeks, is the same as 70 Sabbaths, *i. e.* according to the Prophetic Style, 70 Weeks of Years. So that his Argument for shewing *Daniel's Time* to consist of 360 Days, weighs backward; for if the Case be so, then we may have Reason to suppose that the *Weeks* in this Prophecy must be computed in a different manner; had it indeed been said, 70 *Times* are determined, then we might suppose they should be counted by so many times 360 Days, so that here is a plain and absolute Distinction. As to the Rise of the Word *Time* used by *Daniel* and by *St. John*, we may perhaps not be able to give any certain Account of it; the *Chaldeans* and some other

other People in *Daniel's* Time are said to have used such a Year, i. e. a Year of 360 Days, with an Addition of five Days at the End of it; 'tis possible the *Jews* in those Times might make use of this Word, *Time*, to denote that sort of Time or Year that was used by most of the Nations round 'em; however that be, when this Prophecy says, 70 *Weeks* (or *Sabbaths*) of Years are determined upon, &c. no one who rightly considers the Matter, will think that they are to be counted any otherwise than by *Sabbatical* Years, either solar or lunar.

It should also be observed that the 7th Chapter of *Daniel* was written in the *Chaldee* Language, which makes it more probable that he should here use the Word *Time*, to denote such a Time (for it was not their full Year) as was then in use with the *Chaldæans*. But the Prophecy of the 70 *Weeks* was written in *Hebrew*.

4. Mr. M. has dealt disingenuously by the learned Dean P. with regard to the 15th Year of *Tiberius*, *Luc* iii. 1. Had Dr. P. said that *Tiberius* succeeded *Augustus* in the Empire An. 4725. there would have been some reason in this Exclamation against him for his forsaking of *Ptolemy's* Canon. But when St. *Luc* says, that in the 15th Year of the Reign [Government, *ἡγεμονία*] of *Tiberius*—the Word of God came unto *John*, &c. and as it is proved by incontestible Evidence, that *Tiberius* was taken into Consortship with *Augustus* in governing the Provinces for 2 Years before the Death of *Augustus*, viz. in 4725. and as St. *Luc* was himself a Provincial, and was also recording a Matter which had occurred in one of the Provinces; and as all publick Acts, &c. relating to the Provinces, did pass in the Name of *Tiberius* as well as of *Augustus*,

Augustus, one may suppose that *St. Luc's* 15th Year of the *Government* of *Tiberius*, should rather be dated from the foresaid Year, than from that in which he became *Emperor* of *Rome*. And to what purpose is it for him to shew that *Josephus* and *Eusebius* counted *Tiberius's* Years from *Augustus's* Death? Is that any Proof that *St. Luc* counted the Years of his *Government* from the same *Epocha*? But among other Passages in *Josephus*, this should have been produced for one, viz. *Ant. l. 18. c. 6.* that *Philip* died in the 20th of *Tiberius*, having for 37 Years reigned over *Trachonitis*, &c. This would not only prove that *Josephus* counted *Tiberius's* Years from *Augustus's* Death (which no one denies) but will also be one good means to shew that *St. Luc* counted the Years of *Tiberius's* *Government* from the Time when he began to govern the Provinces. For this does undoubtedly place *Herod's* Death in 4710. And as *St. Luc* says that our Saviour was of about 30 Years when he began, i. e. in the 15th of *Tiberius*; and as the 15th of *Tiberius's* Empire began *Aug. 19. 4741.* thirty Years counted back from this Time, will reach no farther than to *August 19. 4711.* which was about a Year and a half after *Herod's* Death. *Mr. M.* has in this Matter so blended the Ministry of our Saviour with that of *John Baptist*, that he has hardly left room to distinguish which began first. However, taking it according to his middle Terms, i. e. that *John's* Ministry began toward the latter end of *A. D. 28.* and that *Christ's* began in the beginning of 29. viz. we will suppose that *John* began his Ministry about 6 Weeks before *Christ's* Baptism, and that *Christ* began his Ministry about 6 Weeks after: How can this consist with the Words of the Prophets and Evangelists? Was 6 Weeks (nay 6 Months) a Time

sufficient for *John* to have baptiz'd such Multitudes as the 3 Evangelists do say were baptized by him, before Christ came to be baptized? *All the People*, *Luc* iii. 21. And was 3 Months (I might say 30 Months) a Time sufficient for him to make those Preparations for the coming of the Messiah, as foretold by the Prophets? His Assertion that the first Passover in Christ's Ministry (*John* ii. 13.) was that in *A. D.* 29. is no ways conclusive: He says, that the 46th Year, from the time that *Herod* began to build the Temple, did expire some time in Spring *A. D.* 29. Suppose it did, it might be later than the Passover. It is too great a Nicety to think that the *Jews*, in a hasty Expression, counted with any Preciseness; he might almost as well have said that our Saviour was above 40 Years old when the *Jews* said to him, *Thou art not yet 50 Years old*. But Mr. *M.* mistakes the Year when *Herod* began to build the Temple. Dr. *Prideaux*, Part II. Book IX. shews, that it was not begun till *An. P.* 7. 4697. Besides, he must suppose that there were 5 Passovers in the Time of Christ's Ministry, which are not to be found in St. *John*.

Mr. *Lancaster*, p. 113. has roundly asserted that there were 5 Passovers in the time of Christ's Ministry, and not finding so many in St. *John*, he says, that St. *John* omitted the mention of the 3d Passover, but will have it that this Passover is deducible from the other Evangelists, who speak of Christ's walking through the Corn-Fields on the first Sabbath after the second Day of the Passover, and that they do give a particular Account of what was done this Year in *Galilee*. He had said, p. 111. that the *Baptist* being cast into Prison a little after the first Passover, our Saviour, so soon as he heard of it, went into
Galilee,

Galilee, *Matt.* iv. 12. It could not be a little, but 8 Months at the least, when Christ returned into *Galilee*, *John* iv. 35. Now what Reason can from hence be urged, that the Passover, soon after which Christ walked through the Corn, should not be the same with that in *John* v. 1.? Can any one imagine that the Words, *John* vi. 1. [After these Things] should mean a Time two Years after the Things last mentioned? All the Appearance of Reason that Mr. L. could have for such a Conjecture (beside his endeavouring to explain the Words in the Gospels, so as to suit his mistaken Hypothesis of *Daniel's* 70 Weeks) seems to be, that St. *Matthew* has related so many Passages between Christ's return into *Galilee*, c. iv. 12. and his going through the Corn, ch. xii. 1. that there was probably some Passover intervening. And he would have had much more Reason for such a Supposition, had he observed what Time of the Year it was when Christ returned into *Galilee* after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment, *John* iv. provided *John* were then imprisoned. I am indeed of Opinion that St. *Matthew* does pass by some Passover in this part of his History, but am far from thinking it to be any second Passover, but rather the first, viz. that in *John* ii. 13. But above all, why must it be thought that St. *John* did omit the mention of any one Passover? We find he mentions one c. vi. 4. though he does not say that *Jesus* went to it, and probably he did not; so that we have all the Reason in the World to think that had there been any other, St. *John* would have mentioned it, whether *Jesus* had gone to it or not. But of this Matter I shall speak more fully hereafter, when I come to enquire of the Time of *John's* Imprisonment. These two learned Men have,

have, I think, dislocated the Time of our Saviour's, and of *John Baptist's* Ministry, merely to serve an Hypothesis. Mr. *L.* because he would have *Daniel's* last Week (which he would have to contain more than 7 Years) to begin at the Time when Christ entered on his Ministry. And Mr. *M.* because he thought it of Use for shewing the Erroneousness of Dr. *Prideaux's* Scheme, which may be well enough done without this erroneous Help. Mr. *M.* p. 188. says, that Bishop *Usher* places the beginning of *John's*, and the beginning of Christ's Ministry both in the same Year; either Mr. *M.* or else some other learned Men, must have grossly mistaken the Bishop in this Matter (see Dr. *Wall's Def. of Hist.* p. 295. and *Crit. Notes*, p. 64.) Bishop *Usher* did indeed suppose that Christ was baptized in the same Year that *John* began his Ministry; but then withal he supposed that Christ did, after this, continue to live a private Life for about three Years before he entered on his Ministry. It seems an Error to think that Christ was baptized so early; but it may lie upon Mr. *M.* to shew that he has done Justice to that great Man, in making him say that *John's* and Christ's Ministry both began in one Year. Mr. *M.* saw from what was said by Dr. *P.* p. 292. (on which Subject he says, p. 186. that he will expostulate a little with Mr. *Dean*) that Bishop *Usher* placed the beginning of *John's* Ministry in 4739. And does he think that he would also place Christ's Ministry in this Year (or within a Year from this Time) and so make there to be 6 or 7 Passovers in his Ministry? And there is a Gratitude due to the Pains of that worthy Man, in observing and confirming this true 15th Year of *Tiberius*; for though he might mistake the
true

true Meaning of St. *Luc* c. iii. 23. so far as to think that Christ was (or began to be) 30 at his Baptism; yet setting this aside, there can't be any better way of reconciling the Accounts of the Prophets and Evangelists in this Matter, than by supposing *John's* Ministry to have begun in this Year. Must the Time of our blessed Saviour's Ministry (when began by his Messenger) be so streightened as not to be consistent with the Accounts of the Prophets and Evangelists, merely to serve an Hypothesis, which being examined, appears in itself groundless? As to the Scheme of Mr. *L.* concerning the 70 Weeks, it has many Incongruities. For

1. His computing these Weeks by 70 sabbatical Years with their 10 Years of *Jubilee*, can't consist with Reason; for supposing that a *Jubilee*, or Week of Weeks, did contain fifty Years, yet 'tis sure that a single Week, or Sabbatical Year, did contain no more than 7 Years; and therefore as the Time in this Prophecy is not measur'd by *Jubilees*, but by single Weeks, or Sabbatical Years, therefore seventy Weeks can mean no more than 70 times 7 Years, *i. e.* 490 Years.

2. He has made a Command to go forth to restore and build, (or to cause the Restauration, &c. of) *Jerusalem*, before there really was any such thing, nay not so much as for building the Temple; for he antedates *Cyrus's* Decree by about 2 Years. He will indeed have it, that *Cyrus* and *Darius* reigned jointly over *Babylon*, and so, that *Daniel's* first of *Darius*, c. ix. 1. is the same with *Ezra's* first of *Cyrus*, c. i. 1. This Matter is well accounted for by Dr. *P. Connert.* p. 125. and by others, *viz.* That tho' *Babylon* was taken by *Cyrus* (for *Darius* was not present at the taking of it) yet that it had been agreed on between 'em that

that *Darius* (Uncle to *Cyrus*) should have the Title of all their Conquests so long as he lived, but as *Cyrus* did actually take the City, so some prophane Authors do, it seems, reckon *Cyrus's* Reign over *Babylon*, from the taking of the City, but others, from the Time of *Darius's* Death, which was two Years after. Now it is plain that *Daniel* reckons by this latter Computation, for he, ch. v. 30. says, *Belshazzar the King of the Chaldeans was slain, and Darius took the Kingdom.* Now as *Darius* was not present at the taking of the City, but *Cyrus* was, therefore had they reigned jointly over it; and as *Daniel* names but one, he would rather have said, *Cyrus took* (or accepted) *the Kingdom*; so that it is plain from *Daniel*, that he did not count the Years of *Cyrus*, but from *Darius's* Death. And when *Cyrus's* Decree did go forth, he did not order the City to be built, as was before shewn. He also dislocates the Time of *Ezra's* coming to *Jerusalem*, 1st, by absurdly striking off five Years from the Reign of *Darius Hyft.* Now if the Authority of *Ptolemy's* Canon, &c. would not convince Mr. *L.* of his Mistake in this Matter, methinks that of *Ezra* might. Mr. *L.* p. 96. (according to the Time of Year when *Darius*, and when *Xerxes* died) says, *Artaxerxes Longim.* began his Reign in *May* or *June.* Now *Ezra* c. vii. 7, 8, 9. says, that the first of *Nisan*, and the first of *Ab*, were both in the King's 7th Year, therefore his Reign could not begin between *March* and *July.* 2dly, And besides, *Ezra's* going to *Jerusalem* could not be in the same *Julian* Year in which the King's 7th Year began. His misplacing the beginning of this King's Reign might indeed be pretty much owing to his not allowing for the seven Months of *Artabanus*;

banus; but still his cutting off five Years from *Darius* can never be allowed. Sir *Isaac Newton* says, *Darius reigned 36 Years, by the unanimous Consent of all Chronologers, Chron. p. 352.*

3. His making the 70th Week to end three or four Years after Christ's Passion, is a very precarious Computation; for the Apostles were endeavouring to confirm Christ's Covenant, as well with *Jews* as *Gentiles*, for a longer Time than this.

4. Mr. *L.* don't allow that the Prophecy had predicted any particular Events to be accomplished in the first period of seven Weeks, as if he counted it only a mere *Hebraism* in dividing the Number 69 into two Parts; he might almost as well have counted it so in dividing the whole Number of 70 into three Parts; whereas it is sure that the seven Weeks were determined for the rebuilding of *Jerusalem*. Mr. *Marshall* is of Opinion, that the Words, v. 25. *in troublous times*, should rather be rendered strictly as they lie in the Original, viz. *in angustia Temporum*, i. e. *in straight* (or Narrowness, or Pittiance) *of the Times*, or Periods, i. e. that of the two Periods, of 7 and 62 Weeks, the shortest of them should be the Time in which *the Street and Wall should be built again*. The Words may doubtless be very properly taken in this Sense. But what Mr. *M.* adds, viz. that 'tis only an *Hebraism* in the Prophecy in describing the City by *the Street and the Wall*, does not seem very probable; besides, he would have it that the Word which is rendered *Wall* means the whole *Area* or Compass of Ground on which the City had stood, which would render the Word *Streets* needless. It seems (as I said) not improbable that by these Words there seems to have been predicted

predicted two Periods in the Building, especially since the Event seems so to have been, *Neb. c. xi. 1.* says, *And the Rulers of the People dwelt at Jerusalem; the rest of the People also cast Lots, to bring one of ten to dwell in Jerusalem.* Now 'tis plain by the Order of his History, that this was after his return from *Persia*, viz. about *Artax. 37.* For in ch. vii. he mentions what was done by him after the Walls were finished, which might be about *Artax. 28.* viz. That *the City being large, but the People few therein, and the Houses unbuilt, he gathered together the Nobles, &c.* in order, as is probable, to see who did belong to *Jerusalem.* Then he proceeds through all this Chapter to give a Catalogue of those who had come up in the first of *Cyrus.* And then c. viii. ix. and x. contain an Account of what was done by him and *Ezra* between the Time of the finishing of the Walls, and that of his going to *Persia.* And then ch. xi. does manifestly begin a History of what occurred upon his return; for he proceeds through all this Chapter to give an Account of the Names and Numbers of those that dwelt in *Jerusalem*, and of the Places where the rest of the People dwelt (and ch. xii. so far as to ver. 27. is an Interpolation) and from ver. 27. of ch. xii. *ad finem, Nebem.* returns back to relate in what manner the People were ranked at the Dedication of the Wall; and at ch. xiii. 1. he resumes his History (which had ended at ch. xi. ver. ult.) of what occurred upon his return from *Persia*, viz. *On that Day* (or at that Time, *Tempore illo*) *there was read in the Book of Moses, &c.* And ver. 4. *And before this* (i. e. before the numbering the People at *Jerusalem*, ch. xi.) *Eliashib the Priest having, &c.* It appears from ver. 6. that *Eliashib's* taking *Tobiab* into a Chamber of

the Temple was in *Nebemiah's* Absence, *i. e.* after *Artax.* 32. and therefore the Time when the Rulers dwelt at *Jerusalem*; but the rest in the other Cities, ch. xi. must be after *Nebemiah's* return from *Persia*. Now by all this it appears that when the Walls were finished (which seems, as *Josephus* says, to be about *Artax.* 28.) *Nebemiah* took care to get a Genealogy of the People in order, as for other Uses, so also, to know whose Right and Duty it was to come and dwell at *Jerusalem*; and having given Orders in this as well as other Matters, he in a few Years went into *Persia*, and upon his return he found that the Building had gone on so prosperously, that some Thousands of the chief Men, Rulers, &c. had built them Houses and dwelt in *Jerusalem*, ch. xi. Now these thousands of the principal Houses, together with the Walls, &c. would compose the chief Streets of the City; and this seems probable to be what is denoted in the Prophecy by the Word *Street*; for though the Word be in the singular Number, yet Mr. *M.* says that learned Men suppose it to mean a Number of them, as is usual in many Cases, *viz.* *Platea pro Plateis pluribus, per Synecbd.* But *Nebemiah* intended more than this. He found that there was still a great part of the City unbuilt, therefore he prevailed with as many as were willing to leave their Country Affairs, to come and dwell at *Jerusalem*, and then ordered that every tenth Man should be taken by Lot, to come thither, in order to have the City replenished with Houses and Inhabitants. But as his History does not go on to relate what was done in it, so also it must be observed, that this Time when he endeavoured to bring Numbers of People into the City, was but about three Years before the Death of *Artaxerxes*,

taxerxes, and at his Death the Commission (if not the Life) of *Nehemiab* was at an end. Now from the Death of *Artaxerxes*, there were about 27 Years to come of seven Lunar Weeks from the Time that *Jerusalem* was begun to be built. And as it is probable that the remaining part of the City would have been finished in less time, had it gone prosperously on, so also there seems, as was said, to have been pretty much of a Hindrance made in it during the Reign of *Darius Notbus*; but probably they might get a License from the next King for the compleating of it, and might then finish it in about seven Years; and this filling up of all the remaining void Places, seems to be that which is denoted in the Prophecy by the Word *Ditch*.

But to return to Mr. *L.* his leaving the seven Weeks as vacant, not allowing that the Prophecy had foretold what Events were to be accomplished at the end thereof, seems manifestly to be a misapprehending of the true Meaning of it, and such as will, of it self, invalidate his whole Scheme.

And as to the Scheme of Mr. *M.* beside what was before observed, it may be added, that it leaves no Mark or Character, whereby the *Jews* could be able to know the Time of Christ's coming, till at, or after, the Time of his being cut off, which, for certain, is a mistaken Hypothesis. Those Words in the Prophecy, concerning the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and the Calamities to be brought upon the *Jews* (considering the Time when they happened) are indeed the most difficult parts of it, and might give occasion to the learned Bishop *Lloyd* (and Mr. *M.* from him) to suppose that the 70 Weeks were not to end till that Time. But that they were to end at the
Passion

Passion of our blessed Saviour, is, I think, so plain, that no solid Argument can ever be given to the contrary; for then were compleated all those Events, for which the 70 Weeks had been determined; for then was Transgression restrained; Then was Sin sealed up; Then was Expiation made for Iniquity; Then was everlasting Righteousness brought in; Then was Vision and Prophecy fulfilled; Then had the most Holy been Anointed; Then had a firm Covenant been made with many in one Week. Finally, Then (virtually) was Sacrifice and Oblation made to cease, or, abolished; Then (virtually) was the Destruction of the City and Sanctuary, and the Desolations, brought upon the *Jews*. 'Tis plain that those Words concerning the Destruction of the City, &c. are to be taken in this Sense, *viz.* that the *Jews*, by their horrid Crime in rejecting and cutting off the Messiah, should thereby bring upon themselves those direful Calamities here predicted, to all Intents and Purposes, as if they were then actually accomplished; only God, out of his tender Mercy, was pleased to delay the Execution of these Punishments for several Years, to allow the *Jews* time to repent and escape them. I observe that the learned Mr. *Lancaster* has given a Translation of the Words in this Prophecy, which makes this Matter still plainer; and as he seems to be well skilled in the *Hebrew*, I will beg leave to transcribe some part of it, not varying at all from his rendering of the Words, only, will take the Liberty to differ a little from him, in the Notes, deducible from the Words, *viz.*

Dan. ix. 24. *Seventy Weeks are determined upon thy People, and upon thy Holy City [viz. for the following*

following Purposes] *to finish the Transgression, &c.*

Ver. 25. *But know and understand, from the going forth of the Commandment to cause the Restoration and Rebuilding of Jerusalem, there shall be unto Messiah the Prince, seven Weeks [while Jerusalem is rebuilding] and Weeks threescore and two; the Street shall be built again, and the Wall, even in troublous Times.*

Ver. 26. *And after threescore and two Weeks [following the 7 Weeks] the Messiah shall be cut off, but it shall be nothing to him. And the People of the Prince that is to come [the Jews, the Messiah's People] shall [by putting him to Death, thereby] cause (or occasion) the Destruction of the City and the Sanctuary, and the end [the complete Destruction] thereof shall be with a Flood; [by a sudden Irruption, like to an Inundation, of Roman Armies] And to the end of the War [War brought upon them for the foresaid Reason] all kinds of Desolations are determined.*

Ver. 27. *Nevertheless he [the Messiah, though his People (the major part) will reject him, and put him to Death, yet some will adhere to him, and receive his Covenant, and deliver it down to future Ages; so that before he be cut off, he] shall make a firm Covenant with many in one Week [viz. the 70th] and in the middle (or half Part) of the (said) Week, he shall [by preaching up everlasting Righteousness during all the former part of this last half-Week, and by offering up of himself as the one Oblation at the End of it] cause the Sacrifice and Oblation to cease, and bring over a Wing of Abominations, [i. e. ruling, presiding over, or influencing an Army of Idolaters*

laters, viz. the Romans] *he shall be continually making Desolation ; and until the final Time determined, he shall be poured out [the Vengeance of his Blood] upon the Desolate [viz. the Jews made desolate by the Roman Armies, over which CHRIST presided.]*

Here appears a notable Difference in the Opinions of these three learned Men, about the Meaning of the Words v. 26. *The People of the Prince that shall come.* Dr. Prideaux supposes the Word *Prince* to mean *Titus*, and the *People*, Roman Armies. Mr. Marshall and Mr. Lancaster do both suppose the Word *Prince* to mean the Messiah, but with this Difference ; Mr. L. supposes *the People* to be the *Jews*. Mr. M. would have the Words to be rendered thus, viz. *The Messiah's future People*, meaning, *The Romans*, and would have the Words v. 27. to begin thus, *It* (meaning the *Roman People*) *shall make a firm Covenant with.* &c. As if all the Meaning of these latter Words was, that the *Romans* should make a League of Peace with some neighbouring People ; this is much too jejune a Meaning : Besides, the whole *Gentile World* were to be the Messiah's future People as well as the *Romans* ; only none of 'em could strictly be called his People while they remained in Heathenism, as the *Romans* were when they destroyed *Jerusalem*. Dr. P. seems to have mistaken the Meaning of the Words v. 26. for the Word *Prince* seems plainly to mean the same Messiah (or anointed) *Prince* that was to come, as in v. 25. and the Word *He*, v. 27. seems plainly to have the Word *Prince*, v. 26. for its Antecedent. Mr. L. had, I think, the most judicious Opinion of the Meaning of these Words, especially since he says that the *Heb.*

Verb

Verb here being in *Hiphil* should not be rendered, *shall destroy the City, &c.* but, *shall cause the Destruction of, &c.* But whereas he would draw the same Inference from a Verb of the same Form in *v. 25.* that does not necessarily follow; because if the Building of *Jerusalem* did immediately ensue upon the Command going forth, then that Command did cause the Restoration and Rebuilding of *Jerusalem*. All that I have in the least varied from Mr. *L.* in the *Words*, is, (middle, or half part) he says the Word *Chatzi* is used in Scripture for, the *middle* of any Thing. Dr. *P.* and Mr. *M.* do say, 'tis used to signify the *half part*. As it has been us'd in both ways, therefore it may be taken for either, as the Circumstances require.

These two learned Men take very little notice about the proper Meaning of the Word rendered by the *Eng.* in *v. 24. determined.* Mr. *L.* nothing at all; and Mr. *M.* passes it over so slightly as if he thought it not worth regarding; he does indeed say, *p. 181.* That *Africanus, &c.* in their *groundless* Interpretation of the Word *Nech-tac,* imagined an Abbreviation of the Years, &c. and that the *Vulg.* does so render it. These perhaps he might think were too ancient and old-fashioned to be regarded, and the *LXX.* Translation is still more ancient. Whereas whenever there appears any great Difficulty in the Sense of the *Heb.* either as to the Meaning of the Context or other Circumstances, most learned and judicious Men are willing to have Recourse to the *LXX.* when the *Heb.* and that do differ; and they do here differ, as to this Word, according to the Opinions of these several learned Men here mentioned, but I have been informed by so good Judges that the Sense of the Word both in the *Heb.* and

the LXX. is the same, that I have no farther doubt of it, and the Circumstances do manifestly confirm it. But I wonder why Mr. *M.* of all Men should reject this Sense of the Word, because the Year that he makes use of in computing of the 70 Weeks was undoubtedly an abbreviated Year (tho' not of the *Jewish* Form, and therefore not to be allowed in this Case) for the *Chaldeans*, &c. who observed a Year of 12 Months of 30 Days each, had withal an Addition of 5 Days at the End of their 12th Month. Mr. *M.* would mince the Matter by saying, that this Year of 365 Days had been introduc'd before *Daniel's* Time, but would intimate that it was not of common Use, known only to the Learned, &c. Surely if it had been introduced (as doubtless it had) before *Daniel's* Time, then it was their common Year; and the Vulgar, if they could not be able to account for the Reasons of its having been at first introduced (*i. e.* the five additional Days) yet they could not but know how many Months and Days they had from one new Year's Day to the next. The *Rabbins* having pretty much chang'd the Use of the Word, and it being no where us'd in Scripture but in this Text, seems to have made a sad Confusion in the Opinions of learned Men concerning the Meaning of this important Prophecy. I shall say no more, but leave it to a judicious Reader, who, by observing the whole Circumstances in this Case, will be able to determine (if I may so use that Word) whether the old Method used by *Africanus* ought to be rejected. Very often the old Method proves to be the best, see Dr. *Wall* on *Luc.* iii. 23.

As to what has been here said concerning the Method used by *Africanus*, it must be taken as spoken only with regard to the chief Circumstances

ces

ces in this Case ; for as I pretend not to have read what was said by that ancient Author ; so I perceive by what is said by Dr. *Wall* in *Def. of Hist.* p. 288. that *Africanus* was one of those learned Men among the Ancients who had held a Notion (which tho' a plain Mistake, was then it seems, too common) That Christ's Preaching lasted but one Year. But tho' he might not adjust all the Circumstances of it, yet the Ground-work of his System, *i. e.* in dating the 70 Weeks from the Time when *Nebemiab* went up to build *Jerusalem*, and ending 'em at the Passion of Christ, and reckoning the Time by lunar Years, is, I think, undoubtedly the true Method.

The late learned Dr. *Clarke* has also given a very injudicious Account concerning the several Passages in this Prophecy. It is not much indeed that the Doctor has said in this Matter, and so much the better ; for of all that he has said, there is hardly one thing that can appear reasonable even to the meanest Capacity.

He first takes the Words (to restore and build *Jerusalem*) in a figurative Sense, and so, dates the 70 Weeks from the Time when *Ezra* went up to restore the State of the *Jews*. And then he takes the Words (the Street shall be built again and the Wall) in a literal Sense, and so, dates the 62 Weeks from the 28th of *Artaxerxes* when the Wall of *Jerusalem* was finished, and makes 'em to end at the Birth of Christ.

He first makes the 70 Weeks to end at the Death of Christ, and then makes the one Week (which doubtless was one of the 70) to begin at the same Time, and to end in the 7th Year following. And then, makes the half-week (which doubtless was half of the said one Week) to begin 27 Years after the Expiration of the one Week.

If the Doctor would have had this Account appear any ways consistent with the Prophecy, he should have shewn that there were 49 Years from the 7th to the 28th of *Artaxerxes*.

The bare mentioning of this Scheme is a sufficient Confutation of it, and my only Reason for mentioning of it is to shew that all the Attempts that have been made by some of our greatest Men in this Matter, are some way or other erroneous, which is no small Reason for supposing that there is no way of adjusting all the Circumstances in this Case, but by the ancient Method of computing the Time by Lunar Years.

However the Doctor (as well as Mr. *Launcester*) says that the Words, v. 27. should be rendered, *Nevertheless he shall confirm, &c.* which much helps to clear the Sense; for this shews that tho' (as had been said, v. 26.) Messiah was to be cut off after the 62 Weeks, yet, or *nevertheless, he should confirm a Covenant with many in one Week*, which explains the Meaning of the Word *After* in v. 26. And this, together with the proper rendering of the Words, v. 26. (as shewn by Mr. *Launcester*) i. e. *The People of the Prince that is to come shall cause the Destruction of, &c.* And with a proper rendering of the Words, v. 25. (as shewn by Mr. *Marshall*) i. e. *In strait of the Times*. And by taking the Words, v. 25. in a proper Meaning (as rendered by the LXX, &c.) i. e. *70 Weeks are contracted upon, &c.* This together with some Observation of the Circumstances in this Case, do evidently shew in what manner this important Prophecy is to be taken. And for the Sake of a vulgar Reader (for whose Use this little Piece is chiefly intended) I will set down the Words in the Prophecy according to this Sense, and will briefly recapitulate the Circumstances as they

they have here been interspersed, in order to shew how exactly this Prophecy has been fulfilled in all the Branches of it, viz.

Dan. ix. 24, &c. *Seventy Weeks* (of Years) are cut short upon thy People, and upon thy holy City, to finish the Transgression, &c.—Know therefore and observe ; from the going forth of the Word to cause the Restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, there shall be seven Weeks and sixty two Weeks ; the Streets shall be built again, and the void Places, but this, in the shorter of the Times. And after the sixty two Weeks the Messiah shall be cut off but not for himself (and the People of the Prince that shall come will cause the Destruction of the City and the Sanctuary, and the End thereof shall be with a Flood, and unto the End of the War, Desolations are determined.) Nevertheless he shall confirm a Covenant with many in one Week, and in the half of the Week he shall cause the Sacrifice and Oblation to cease ; and with a Wing of Abominations he shall make Desolations, and until the final Time determined he shall be poured out upon the Desolate.

Accordingly, *Nebemiah* having (in the forepart of *A. P. J.* 4270.) obtained a Commission from *Artaxerxes* for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and coming thither in the latter Part of this Year, he then gave forth the Word which caused the Restoration of &c. see c. ii. 1—18. [*N. B.* The Words v. 18. *And they said, let us rise up and build*, are in the LXX. and *Vulg.* Translations ; *And I said, let us, &c.*] and in about 18 Years the Wall and a great Number of the principal Houses were rebuilt, see c. vi. 1—15. c. vii. 5. c. xi. 1. &c. then the Streets were built again. And (so far as can be gathered by Circumstances) in about 31 Years more all the remaining void Places of the City were filled up with Buildings, and so, *The Streets*

Streets and void Places were built again even in Straitness of the Times, i. e. in the 7 Weeks. And here the longer Period of the 62 Weeks was to commence, and at the End hereof Messiah was to come. Now if we count 7 and 62 Weeks of Lunar Years, i. e. 483 Years (which make 468 Solar Years and about 7 Months) downwards from the latter Part of A. P. 7. 4270. These 2 Periods will reach to much about the middle of 4739. A. D. 26. and in this very Year, and very probably (as was shewn) in the middle of this Year the Messiah did come; for then as St. Luc c. iii. says, The Word of God came unto John, and he came into all the Country preaching, &c. and then as St. Marc. c. i. 1. says, was The Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Then there had been unto Messiah the Prince 7 Weeks and 62 Weeks. And then the one Week did commence, in which the Messiah did (by his Messenger) begin to make a firm Covenant with many: and when John had been preaching about 3 Years and an half, and had first preached before his coming, the Baptism of Repentance to all the People of Israel (Acts xiii. 24.) then Christ himself (having been baptized by John, and having then in a most eminent manner been anointed, Mat. iii. 16, 17. Dan. ix. 24.) did (toward the latter end of A. D. 29.) enter on his sacred Ministry of preaching the Gospel of everlasting Righteousness, Dan. ix. 24. John i. 29. to ii. 11. Mat. iv. 12. &c. and in this half-part of the Week, Christ our Saviour by preaching the Gospel all the former part of it, and by offering up of himself as the one Offering (Hebr. x. 14.) at the End thereof (i. e. at the Passover, Apr. 3. A. D. 33.) did cause to cease (or abolish) the Sacrifices and Oblations in the Jewish Law: Then was Messiah cut off after the 62 Weeks, when

when he had confirmed a Covenant with many in one Week. Then *he was taken away by Distress and by Judgment, but who shall declare his Generation* [*i. e.* who can describe the Wickedness of his People] *for he was cut off out of the Land of the Living.* See Margin, *Is. liii. 8.* Then *did the People of the Prince that should come, cause the Destruction of the City and Sanctuary, &c.* *Dan. ix. 26.* and in about 37 Years (*A. D. 70.*) the City and Temple were destroyed by the Romans, and many more and sad Desolations brought upon the Jews as all know: and that these Calamities were brought upon 'em for their utter rejecting and crucifying our Lord Christ, no one will deny.

It may be objected that I place the Beginning of Christ's Ministry some Months too early, because *St. John c. i. and ii.* says that our Saviour upon his coming into *Galilee*, wrought the Miracle at *Cana*, and went from thence to *Capernaum*, and then after he had tarried there not many Days, went up to *Jerusalem* at the Passover (which was *A. D. 30.*) and, that this Return into *Galilee*, and going to *Capernaum* can't be the same with that in *Matt. iv.* when (as *St. Matt.* says) *from that Time Jesus began to preach*, because he says, *v. 12.* that *John* was then imprisoned (and so 'tis said *Marc. i. 14.*) whereas *St. John, c. iii.* says that he was not imprisoned till a good while after this Passover. I shall not here use any Words for clearing of this Matter, but desire the Reader to suspend his Judgment till he comes to the Places where I treat of the Time of *John's* Imprisonment; where I hope to make it appear plain to a judicious Reader that Christ's Return into *Galilee*, *Matt. iv. 12. Marc i. 14. Luc iv. 14.* was the same with that in *John i. 43.* notwithstanding what is said in *Matt.* and *Marc* concerning *John* being in Prison.

SECTION



SECTION II.

THE next thing I proposed to be enquired into, is, *The Time of CHRIST's Birth.*

In order to a right Apprehension of the Circumstances in this Case, it will be proper to take Notice of (what I at first observed, *i. e.*) the Translation of the Words, *Luc* iii. 23. as given by Dr. *Wall* in his Note on this Text. The Reader will not expect it from me, to canvass the Property of the *Greec* Phrase here. I shall only observe these few Things, *viz.* That this Gentleman was known to be a good Judge of the *Greec* Language, and, that he has here referr'd his Reader to several other Places in the *New Testament*, where *Ἀρχομαι* and *Ἀρχομενος* are so used as he has here rendered it: and 'tis the more to the Purpose, that these Places are all of St. *Luc's* Writing. What *Kepler* may have said in this Matter, I know not, having no Opportunity of seeing his Works. But I am of Opinion that there may be added to these Proofs, the Instance of a very early Christian Writer (*Justin Martyr*) taking this Text in the same Way. This Citation had been produc'd by Dr. *Wall* in his *Defence*, p. 298. It must be noted that the Doctor had not, when he wrote this *Defence*, the same Conception of the Meaning of this Text, as he had afterwards, when he wrote his *Notes*. This will appear obvious to a Reader of both Books. So that he had brought the following Citation to shew (as he then thought) that

that *Justin* read this Text without *αἰχόμενος* in it; for having here shewn a Scheme of Dr. *Allix* concerning the Time of CHRIST's Birth, who had supposed that CHRIST was 33 at the Time that St. *Luc* (by *Engl. &c.*) had said that, *Jesus himself began to be about 30 Years of Age*. And that he had (to answer an obvious Objection against this Scheme) said, that *Clem. Alex. Strom.* 1. read in it, not *αἰχόμενος*, but *εἰχόμενος*; and that the *Codex Vat.* has the Text so. Dr. *Wall* adds, that 'tis pretty plain that *Justin Martyr* read the Text without *αἰχόμενος* in it. For he in his *Dialog. circa Medium*, p. 94. *Ed. Steph.* laying before *Trypho* a short Account of the Passages of our Saviour's Life, says, that, *he having staid τριᾶχοντα ἔτη, ἢ πλείονα, ἢ καὶ ἐλάσσονα thirty Years, or some more, or some fewer, until John came, &c.* Now, I say, the learned Reader will judge whether it be not reasonable to think that *εἰχόμενος* may have been an Error of Transcribers in the foresaid Copy and Author, and that *Justin* did read the Text with *αἰχόμενος* in it, and, that he construed it as Dr. *Wall* has here done. As there is some Impropriety in the *English* Phrase, and as this other Construction of the Words does seem a more proper one; and as it does also appear very suitable for allowing the Birth and the Baptism of our Saviour to be placed so as to agree with other Passages in the Gospels (when compared with other Authentic Histories.) This alone is of great Weight for shewing this Translation to be a proper one.

Now as this seems to be a true Construction of the Meaning of this Text: Then it may be proper to enquire, when this Time was in which (as St. *Luc* says) *Jesus himself was of about thirty Years when he began*. Dr. *Wall* having thus rendered

the Text, Paraphrases it: *When he began*, i. e. when he began to shew himself to the World, to preach, and do Miracles, &c. 'Tis not very plain whether the Doctor supposed these Words to refer to the Time when *John Baptist* began his Ministry, or, when our Saviour himself entered on his Ministry, only his Words seem rather to mean the latter, which does not seem to be very probable, because 'tis not improbable that St. *Luc* might have had an Account of the Year when CHRIST was born, and so, must know what Age he was of at the Time here specified: And tho' his Expression, *about thirty*, might be taken in a little Latitude, if Necessity so required, yet as there seems, I think, to be no such Necessity, it may be reasonable enough to suppose that our Saviour was not so much as one Year over or under 30 at this Time. If St. *Luc* knew in what Year CHRIST was born, we may have Reason to think that he would here have said, *about 33*, or (as I rather think he was) *about 34*, if he did here intend to shew the Time in which CHRIST himself began to preach, &c. Besides, the *Coming*, or *Beginning of the Gospel* of CHRIST, must be taken to have commenc'd with the Ministry of *John*: See *Marc* i. 1. *Prid. Connect.* p. 298. 'Tis plain from the foresaid Citation from *Justin Martyr* [until *John came*, &c.] that he must have so taken this Text; for whether *Justin* read ἀρχόμενος or ἐρχόμενος, *when he began*, or, *when he came*, he must take it to refer to the Time of *John's* Coming. Now if CHRIST was 30, when *John* began his Ministry, and as 'tis probable, as was before said, that the Calling of *John* was about the middle of *An. per. Jul.* 4739. thirty Years counted back from this Time would settle the Birth of CHRIST on the middle of *An. per. Jul.* 4709. But tho' it may

may be probable that St. *Luc* did here reckon with some Preciseness, as to *Years*, yet there is not any Reason to think that he did so, as to *Months*. What is chiefly to be gather'd from this Text, is, not so much for proving the affirmative of what I propos'd, *i. e.* That *CHRIST* was born above a Year before *Herod's* Death, as, to shew that there is nothing here whereby to conclude the negative of it. And also, that 'tis probable that *CHRIST* was not born very much above a Year before *Herod's* Death, so as to have liv'd to full 38 or to 39, as some late learned Men have thought: But, as seems most probable, to 37, and some Months over. Therefore, to come a little nearer to this Point, we must see what is said in some other Texts of Scripture concerning the Birth of *CHRIST*, and compare 'em with some other Histories.

1. As for the Time of *Herod's* Death, I shall take it for granted that he died *An. Per. Jul.* 4710. and a little before the *Jewish* Passover, as *Josephus*, and the *Roman* Histories do, it seems, plainly shew; see *Dr. Wall's Defence*, p. 290, 291, 294, so that the Death of *Herod* was probably in *March* 4710.

2. From the Circumstances in St. *Matthew*, c. ii. 'tis plain that *CHRIST* was born a pretty many Months before *Herod's* Death. The Coming of the *Magi* seems not to have been till several Months after the Birth. Their Distance from *Judæa*, and the Delays that they might make before they would set out on such an Expedition, might take up a considerable Space of Time. So far is plain, they did not come till after the 40 Days of the Blessed Virgin's Purification were over, and after our Saviour had been carried to *Jerusalem* and brought back: For doubt-

less this going to *Jerusalem* could not be after the Warning to *Joseph* to fly into *Egypt* (which was presently after the *Magi's* Departure from 'em) because that would have been (as *Dr. Hammond* says) to throw themselves into *Herod's* Hands, which the Angel had order'd 'em to avoid, by escaping into *Egypt*. And the Doctor on *Luc* ii. 24. gives another Reason why it should not be thought that the *Magi* had come to bring their Presents, before this Journey to *Jerusalem*.

Having here a fit Opportunity, I will intreat the Reader's Patience, while I make a small Digression, in order to take Notice of a seeming Difficulty in reconciling *St. Matthew* with *St. Luc* in this Matter, i. e. concerning the Place to which the *Magi* came to worship Christ.

St. Luc c. ii. says, that after *Jesus* had been born in *Bethlehem*, and that when the Days of *Mary's* Purification were accomplished, they carried *Jesus* to *Jerusalem*, and that when they had there performed all things, &c. they returned into *Galilee*, to their own City *Nazareth*.

Now had it not been for this Passage, a Reader of *St. Matthew* might rather have thought that the *Magi* had come to Christ at *Bethlehem*: but this Passage in *St. Luc* will not allow the Case so to have been, as was shewn just now.

Dr. Hammond and *Dr. Wall* do both say that the *Magi* came to *Bethlehem* while the Child was there: And so says *Dr. Prid.* *Dr. Whitby*, *Mr. Du Pin*, &c. and so probably may others whom I have not seen. If this must be granted, then indeed I think the Matter seems irreconcilable. *Dr. Hammond* saw (and with very good Reason) so much Necessity to suppose that the *Magi* had not come to Christ before his being carried to *Jerusalem*, and yet supposed so much Reason to believe that they

they did come to *Bethlehem*, that he seems to have thought there was no better way of reconciling, than by altering St. *Luc*'s Words (*Paraphr.* on *Luc* ii. 39.) and to say, *They returned to Bethlehem, &c.* any one may see that this can't be St. *Luc*'s Meaning. And his Account is plainly agreeable to the Nature of the Case: For as *Joseph* and *Mary* had been obliged to go to *Bethlehem* to be there enrolled: and as *Mary* happen'd to be there deliver'd, and was then to stay there till the Days of her Purification were ended, and then, to go and present her first-born Son in the Temple: and as they had no farther Occasion to go to *Bethlehem*, it may be naturally supposed that they would then go to their Home at *Nazareth*.

Dr. *Wall* does, I think, come a little nearer to the Point: for tho' he has left the Difficulty in some Measure unsolv'd, yet he goes so far in the Way as to say, (*Note on Luc* ii. 22.) " I see no
" Way of reconciling, but by supposing the
" Dream to have been at *Nazareth*, after the Re-
" turn thither, and the Flight to have been from
" thence, which a Reader of *Matthew* would
" take to have been from *Bethlehem*. This is
" one of the many Difficulties, &c."

The Doctor was, I think, surely right in this Supposition. But then, if a Reader of *Matthew* do take the Dream to have been at *Bethlehem*, and the Flight to have been from thence, this will not agree with St. *Luc*'s Account.

I apprehend no Necessity for a Reader of *Matthew* to take the Matter so. It is not said that *Jesus* was at *Bethlehem* when the *Magi* came to *Jerusalem*, nor is it said that they came to *Bethlehem*. When he (*Herod*) had gathered all the chief *Priests* and *Scribes* of the People together, he demand-
ed of them where *Christ* should be born. And they
said

said unto him, *In Bethlehem of Judæa, for thus it is written, &c.—And he (Herod) sent them (the Wise Men) to Bethlehem.*

Now 'tis manifest that neither *Herod* nor the Priests knew any thing more of *Christ's* being at *Bethlehem*, than from what the Priests had found by the Prophet, *i. e.* That *Christ* should be born there; and this was all the Foundation of *Herod's* sending the *Magi* thither. It may be supposed that the *Magi* departed from *Jerusalem*, with a Purpose of going to *Bethlehem*, as they had been directed. But then, there is not any Reason to suppose the contrary, but that when they were got out on their Journey, the Star might direct their Course to *Nazareth* in *Galilee*.

This Circumstance of *The Star*, does, I think, make pretty much for such a Supposition: For tho' it might be supposed that the Star would have appeared to the *Magi*, had they gone to *Bethlehem*, yet this miraculous Circumstance would appear much more necessary, in case it be thought that they went to *Nazareth*: For as they had been directed to *Bethlehem*, they would then have only the House to search for, which they probably would soon have found, by several Tokens, especially, from the Account of the Shepherd's having come to *Christ* soon after his Birth, *Luc ii. 17.* But if it be thought that *Christ* was then at *Nazareth*, the Case would be quite different, as any one will readily conceive.

The like may be observed, in respect of the great rejoicing of the *Magi* at the Appearance of the Star. They might have rejoiced, had the Star led 'em on to *Bethlehem*, whither they were going, but they would have much more Occasion for rejoicing, if it led 'em to *Nazareth*. *When they had heard the King, they departed, and lo! The Star*

Star which they saw (or had seen) *in the East, went before them* (or led 'em along, *Hamd.*) *till it came and stood over where the young Child was.* There is no doubt but that the *Magi* had had sufficient Instructions how to find *Betlehem*; tho' *Herod* out of a subtle Jealousy, left his murderous Design should be suspected, seems not to have sent any Guide with 'em: if he did send any, then 'tis like that the *Magi* dismissed the Guide upon sight of the Star; but the former is more probable. And probably they had been informed that an ancient Prophet had foretold that *Betlehem* was to be the Place of Christ's Birth; so that they might reasonably entertain Hopes that they should not have much Difficulty in finding the young Child. But when they were got out from *Jerusalem*, and observed that the Star directed 'em in a different Course from that in which they had been directed by *Herod*, in order to go to *Betlehem*, they would then have great Reason for rejoicing; for now they perceived that, had not Providence been pleased to favour 'em with this miraculous Guide, they should not have been able to find that wonderful Child whom they had come so far to see and to adore; so that, *When they saw the Star, they rejoiced with exceeding great Joy.* When they saw that the Star moved on before 'em, they might suppose it would conduct 'em to some City or Village where the Child was, but they could not then be sure that it would point out the very House to 'em; and as their great rejoicing was at the first Appearance of the Star; therefore, 'tis probable that it led 'em in a different Road from that in which they had been directed, in order to go to *Betlehem*.

Nor is there any Reason, from *Herod's* murdering the Infants at *Betlehem*, or, from the Warning

Warning given to *Josepb* to fly into *Egypt*, to conclude that *Christ* was then at *Bethlehem*. For as to the former, it seems to have been pretty sudden, and to have been kept pretty secret, till executed. *Herod*, when he had privily called the *Wise Men*, enquired of 'em diligently, what time the *Star* appeared. And he sent 'em to *Bethlehem*, and said, go and search diligently for the young Child, and when ye have found him, bring me Word again, that I may come and worship him also. He took up his murderous Design from the instant of the *Magi's* declaring that a King was born; and he hoped by Subtilty to get an Account, in what House the Child was, that he might be sure not to miss him, without making any farther Slaughter: but withal, took care to get an Account, what Age the Child was of, that if one Stratagem failed, he might not miss him by a second, *i. e.* by murdering all Male-infants in, and about, the Place, who were under, about, and a little over, the Age of this Child. He made this Enquiry privily, lest his Designs should be suspected, nor would he be too inquisitive, to what place the *Magi* went, lest by these Means he should be defeated in his Enterprize. But when he heard that the *Magi* were gone home, without coming back to him, being enraged at this *Delusion* and Disappointment, and knowing that the sooner his other Design was put in Execution, the more likely it would be to succeed, and not doubting but that the Child still was where he had been born, he sent forth, and slew all the Children that were in *Bethlehem*, &c. There does not seem any Reason to suppose that *Herod* could have any Opportunity of hearing that *Christ* had been removed to *Nazareth*, before he ordered the Children to be slain at *Bethlehem*. Since he had directed the

the
for
plain
and
gon
to v
mig
Slau
lebe
Jer
turn
mig
fant
tion
to
says
lem
Dr.
it,
bee
on
feer
for
Chr
the
If t
they
mig
A
hav
ing
a C
can
Bet
true
ver
zar
mo

the *Magi* to *Bethlehem*, he could have no reason for enquiring, whither they went. Besides, 'tis plain that they had promised him to return to him; and he might, by many ways, hear of their being gone home, without hearing that they had gone to worship Christ at *Nazareth*. But probably he might not defer the Execution of that inhuman Slaughter till he heard of the *Magi*: For as *Bethlehem* is (as is supposed) but 3 or 4 Miles from *Jerusalem*, he might expect the *Magi* to have returned the same Day, and finding they did not, he might on the next, or the third Day order the Infants to be slain. There seems indeed some Question whether the *Magi* could go from *Jerusalem* to *Nazareth* in one Day. *Josephus* (in *vita sua*.) says, 'tis 3 Days Journey from *Galilee* to *Jerusalem*, but seems to mean, for a Foot-passenger. Dr. *Whitby* (who contrary to Reason, will have it, that the *Magi* came to Christ before he had been carried to *Jerusalem*) thinks they might ride on Dromedaries which are swift Travellers. It seems to have been Summer time when they came; for 'tis generally, and probably, supposed that Christ was born in a Winter, and 'tis plain that the *Magi* did not come till some Months afterwards. If they could not reach *Nazareth* in one Day, yet they would not forsake the Sight of the Star, but might travel all Night by the Guidance of it.

As for the Warning to *Joseph*, That seems to have been necessary; for tho' the Order for slaying the Infants at *Bethlehem* could not much affect a Child at *Nazareth*, yet no doubt, when *Herod* came to understand that he had not succeeded at *Bethlehem*, he would endeavour to find out the true Child, elsewhere; and he could hardly be very long without hearing that Christ was at *Nazareth*, what by any Information that his Officers

M

might

might have from some tender Parents at *Bethlehem*, and what by a Rumour of the *Magi* having gone to *Nazareth*; and there is no doubt but that *Nazareth* was in this *Herod's* Jurisdiction.

There seems, I think, no great Difficulty in conceiving an Agreement between these two Evangelists in this Matter, when 'tis observed that each of 'em has one Part of the History which the other omits: So that when St. *Matthew*, c. ii. 1. says, *Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem, there came Wise Men from the East to Jerusalem.* There is not any thing here whereby to conclude the contrary but that the Case might be (as St. *Luc* must be understood, i. e.) that between the Birth at *Bethlehem*, and the Coming of the *Magi*, our Saviour might have been carried to *Jerusalem*, and from thence to *Nazareth*.

From St. *Matthew's* Words in the latter Part of this Chapter, there may indeed be some small Conjecture to question whether he supposes Christ to have been at *Nazareth* before the Return from *Egypt*, but there is no need for such a Supposition, for then it might as well be questioned whether he supposes *Joseph* to have been at *Nazareth* before. It must be observed that St. *Matthew* gives a brief Account of this Part of the History, and as he had, v. 1. named *Bethlehem* only to shew that Christ was born there, not meaning that he was there when the *Magi* came to *Jerusalem*: so he here names *Nazareth*, chiefly to shew that Christ was there educated, and in order to introduce the Prophet's Words cited, v. ult. not meaning here to exclude any Supposition of Christ's having before been at *Nazareth*. As it has been generally (tho' I think erroneously) supposed that *Joseph* made his Flight from *Bethlehem*, so some would have it, that he did intend to return thither

from

from *Egypt*, thinking that Christ was to be educated where he had been born ; but this seems only a Surmize grounded chiefly on the former Error. St. *Matthew* seems here to use the Word *Judæa* so as to include all that Country over which *Herod* had reigned, *Galilee*, &c. When he (*Joseph*) heard that *Archelaus* reigned in *Judæa* in the Room of his Father *Herod*, he was afraid to go thither ; notwithstanding, being warned of God in a Dream, he turned aside into the Parts of *Galilee*, &c. he means that he went into that Part of *Judæa* called *Galilee*. When *Herod* was dead, an Angel appeared to *Joseph* in *Egypt*, ordering him to return into his own Country, and as he returned, he enquired who succeeded *Herod*, and he having been not long dead, and *Archelaus* residing at *Jerusalem*, the People at a Distance might only have heard in general, that *Archelaus* succeeded *Herod* ; and *Joseph* thinking that he reigned over *Galilee*, as his Father had done, he was afraid to go thither ; but being in this doubt, he had a Dream, (which probably informed him that *Archelaus* did not preside over *Galilee*, and that his Brother *Herod* would not seek the Child's Life,) and then, without any doubt, he went home to *Nazareth*, as he had intended to do.

But to return to my Subject.

I said, that the coming of the *Magi* seems to have been a pretty many Months after the Birth of Christ ; this Order for slaying the Infants would seem a pretty plain Confirmation of it : for tho' it was a tyrannical Action in *Herod*, yet by his enquiring so strictly what time the Star appeared, it does not look as if he would so far exasperate the People, beyond what his Designs required, as to murder all Infants who were many Months older, than he supposed *Jesus* to be. And suppos-

ing that the Words be construed as Dr. *Wall* has interpreted 'em, *i. e.* *From the Entrance of two Years.* (See Note on *Mat.* ii. 16.) which, from other Circumstances, seems not unlikely to be the Meaning of 'em, yet still it must, I think, be supposed that *Herod* took Christ to have been about or near a Year old when he made this Order. How long *Herod* lived after this, does not appear, but 'tis not improbable that *Joseph's* Flight into *Egypt*, and his stay there, might take up some Months.

3. 'Tis plain from *Luc* ii. that Christ was born in the Time of some Taxing (or Enrollment) under *Augustus*. No one will doubt that this Enrollment was before *Cyrenius's* Taxing. See Dr. *Wall* on *Luc* ii. 2. and in *Def.* This Explication of St. *Luc's* Words does not (as the Dr. says, *Def.* p. 308.) settle the Time of that Enrollment under which Christ was born. But then he has here p. 305. brought a remarkable Citation from *Tertullian* concerning it, *viz.* l. 4. *contr. Marcion*, c. 19. *Constat Censur actus sub Augusto tunc in Judæa per Sentium Saturninum.*

It is known that there was then (at the Time of Christ's Birth) *a registering of the People in Judæa, made under Augustus, by Sentius Saturninus.* Now the Doctor has here shewn, from *Josephus*, that *Varus* (in whose Time *Herod* died) succeeded *Saturninus* about a Year (as near as can be judged by Circumstances) before *Herod's* Death. Now this Testimony of *Tertullian* seems very considerable in this Matter. He probably had this Account, *i. e.* of the registering, from some Record, or from well-grounded Tradition. From whence he might have the Account of Christ being then born, is uncertain, whether from Tradition, or from his own Guess, knowing him to have been

born under some registering, and judging this of *Saturninus* the most probable. If it were from his own Opinion, it would be of something the less Value, because it appears that the Christian Writers in, and before his Time (for want of one common *Æra* to reckon by) have given very uncertain Accounts of the Time of Christ's Birth. *Justin Martyr* (about 60 Years before) thought Christ to have been born in the Time of *Cyrenius's* Taxing, *Wall's Def.* p. 308. And in his *Note on Acts*, v. 36. he says that *Origen* thought the same. *Irenæus* placed it in the 41st of *Augustus*, (i. e. from his first Consulship.) This, tho' nearer than the other, is yet too late, as being after *Herod's* Death. *Clem. Alex.* placed it 194 Years before the Death of *Commodus*, *Enquiry into Consist of Prim. Church*, Part ii. p. 143. this reckoning will not reach to *Herod's* Death. But what is here chiefly to be regarded is, not so much *Tertullian's* Skill in Chronology, by judging Christ to be born under this Registering (unless he had it from Tradition) as his relating a Matter of Fact, viz. the Registering. *Constat* (says he) *it appears, 'tis manifest, a known Thing.* And if there were a registering so little time before *Herod's* Death (and *Saturninus* came into the Office but 4 or 5 Years before) 'tis very improbable that there should be any other before *Herod* died: for tho' *Augustus* had, during his long Reign, more than one of these Enrollments, yet no one, who rightly considers the Matter, can think that there could be more than one in the Space of 4 or 5 Years, especially since the *Ἀπογραφὴ*, *Luc* ii. 2. or *Census* in *Tertull.* were not Money Taxes, but only a registering of the Person's Names, and, perhaps, of the Value of their Estates. *Dr. Hammond*, note on *Luc* ii. 6. tho' he give but an imperfect Account

Account concerning the Year of Christ's Birth, yet supposes that *Tertullian* is to be credited in this Case, and that Christ was born in the Time of *Saturninus's* Registering. 'Tis not indeed said, in what Year of *Saturninus* this registering was made, but it may be observed that if it were at the very End of his Government, it would be about a Year before *Herod's* Death.

If it be thought probable (from *St. Matthew*) that Christ was born something more than a Year before *Herod's* Death; and (from *St. Luc*) that he was not one Year over or under 30. *When he* (by his Fore-runner) *began*; and (from the Prophecy, &c.) that *John began* about the middle of *An. Per. Jul. 4739*. Then, in order to a near Connection and Agreement in all these Circumstances, one might judge (as there appear no Reasons to the contrary) that this registering might be in the last Year of *Saturninus*, which would begin sometime in the fore-part of *An. Per. Jul. 4708*.

As to the Day, or Month of Christ's Nativity, that is, I suppose, very uncertain. The Account given by *Clem. Alex.* does (as his Lordship in the forecited Place observes) fix the Day to much about the Time where we now observe it. But as *Clement* did mistake the Year, there is the less Regard due to his Account as to the Day. Besides, he did, it seems, say, that other learned Men had given Accounts different from him and from one another, about the Time of Year in which Christ was born. If the Birth was in the latter Part of *December, 4708*. this might be in the Time of *Saturninus*, and it would be 14 or 15 Months before *Herod's* Death. I don't say but that this may agree with the Account in *St. Matthew*, only a little more Time may perhaps seem rather more suitable.

suitable. Sometime in, or towards, the latter Part of 4708. one might guess it to be. Then our Blessed Saviour would have been born a Year and some Months before the Death of *Herod*. On the 39th of *Augustus* (counting from the Murder of *Julius Cæsar*.) Five Years and a little more before the Beginning of the vulgar *Æra*. Then he would be a little above thirty and an half, *When he* (by his Fore-runner) *began* to shew himself to the World. About 34 and an half at the first Passover in his Ministry, *A. D.* 30. *Per. Jul.* 4743. and about 37. and an half at his Passion, 4746.

There does, I think, appear a very great Probability that the Birth was in the Time of *Saturninus*; I don't pretend that this Account does determine it to any one Year of his Government: I propose this as the most probable so as to suit all Circumstances. But that which I would chiefly and humbly propose, is, whether there be not good Reason to conclude that the Birth was at least a Year before *Herod's* Death, (which it must be if it were in the Time of *Saturninus*) because I think that the Accounts given by some late learned Men, Archbishop *Usher*, &c. (*i. e.* That the Birth was in the latter part of 4709.) cannot comport with *St. Matthew's* Gospel.

Some late learned Writers would try to bring down *Herod's* Death 2 or 3 Years below 4710. See Mr. *Lancaster's Chron. Essay*, and Mr. *Marsball's Chron. Treat.* and several others.

Several learned Men had formerly endeavour'd this, thinking *St. Luc* (c. iii. 23.) to have said that *Jesus began to be about 30 Years of Age*, at his Baptism; and that *St. Luc's* 15th of *Tiberius* was his 15th from *Augustus's* Death. See *Dr. Wall's* *Def.* p. 290, &c.

Dr.

Dr. *Prideaux* also, tho' he had a true Conception of St. *Luc's* 15th of *Tiberius*, yet he supposes *Herod* to have died about the Beginning of *A. P. J.* 4711.

Mr. *Lancaster* would prove a Train of Errors upon *Josephus* in this Matter, merely because he over-reckoned the Life of *Augustus* by a Year and some odd Days, which, if certainly true, would not prove all those Errors on him; besides, he would set *Herod's* Death 3 Years later than where most of the Passages in *Josephus* do. And as to the Reign of *Augustus*, 'tis possible *Josephus* might date that from the Murder of his Uncle; and from thence, to the Death of *Augustus*, there were 57 Years and some Months.

All the Passages in *Josephus* concerning this Matter, can't indeed be brought to be consistent one with the other, for some would seem to place *Herod's* Death about 4713. as Mr. *Lancaster* supposes; and some, in 4711, as Dr. *Prideaux* supposes, but by being compared together, it will, I think, appear that most of 'em do place his Death about the Beginning of 4710. as Bishop *Usher*, &c. had supposed. I will mention some of 'em.

1. In his *Antiq.* l. xiv. c. 8. he says that *Jerusalem* was taken by *Pompey* in the Consulship of *C. Antonius* and *M. Tullius Cicero*. And in c. 28. 'tis said that *Sosius* and *Herod* took *Jerusalem* just 27 Years after it had been taken by *Pompey*, and that *Antigonus* was then taken by *Sosius* and carried a Prisoner to *M. Antony* at *Antioch*, who there put him to Death, being bribed thereto by *Herod*. And in l. xvii. c. 10. he says that *Herod* reigned 34 Years from the Death of *Antigonus*. Now *Pompey* took *Jerusalem*, *A. P. J.* 4651. something after the middle of the Year, from

whence 61 Years will reach below the middle of 4712.

Now this is the Passage from which (being compared with what is said concerning the Years of the Reign, and of the Life, of *Augustus*) Mr. *Lancaster* would prove many other Passages to have been Errors committed by *Josephus*. But I believe that when this is compared with the following Passages, it will appear probable that the Number 27 here has been an Error of Transcribers.

2. *Josephus* (*Antiq.* l. xii. c. 14.) says that the 150th Year of the *Æra* of the *Seleucidae* was a Sabbatical Year, (and so 'tis said, 1 *Macc.* c. vi.) and l. xiv. c. 28. he says that the Year in which *Sofius* and *Herod* took *Jerusalem*, was also a Sabbatical Year. Now if there had been a continued Observation of Sabbatical Years during all this Space of Time, then this Space must have contained just such a Number of Years, as would make some certain Number of Sabbatical Years. *Josephus*, *Ant.* l. xiii. c. 15. mentions another Sabbatical Year, and this (by comparing this Place with c. 11. and c. 14.) seems to have been just 28 Years after the former, *i. e.* in the 178th Year. And one would think that the Year in which *Sofius* and *Herod* took *Jerusalem*, should be just 126 Years after the 150th Year. Now as to the Date of that *Æra* which in 1 *Macc.* is called, *The Æra of the Kingdom of the Greeks*, Dr. *Prideaux*, *Connect.* Part i. l. 8. says that it commences from the Spring *A. P. J.* 4402. and so he computes it in all his Annals. In *Joseph.* *Antiq.* l. xii. c. 11. 'tis said that the 145th Year was in the 153d Olympiad, and that the 148th Year was in the 154th Olympiad, *i. e.* That the Feast of Dedication (*December*) was first kept at this Time, three
N Years

Years after the Temple had been desolated by *Antiochus Epiphanes*.

There are indeed two Dates for this Desolation of the Temple, one 6 Months after the other, the one by *Apollonius* in the 3d Month, and the other by *Athenæus* in the 9th Month, both of 'em Officers to *Antiochus*, see *Prid. Connect. sub An. 168*. So that it may be supposed that *Josephus Ant. l. xii. c. 111*. refers to the latter of these; and as this was in the 145th Year, 1 *Macc. i. 54*. and as it was in the 153d Olympiad, so it must be in the 2d Year of it, because the Dedication, which was just 3 Years after, was in the 154th Olympiad, *Joseph. ibid.* And as *An. 2. Olymp. 153*. began about Midsummer, *A. P. 7. 4547*. therefore by this Account the 145th Year of the Kingdom of the *Greeks* began about *March, A. P. 7. 4547*. and consequently the 150th began in *March 4552*. Dr. *Prideaux* does indeed set this Desolation of the Temple in the 168th Year before Christ, but I can't see how this can consist with the Olympic Years. The Doctor (*sub An. 323.*) says that *Alexander M.* died in the middle of Spring *An. 1. Olymp. 114. Ante Christ. 323*. and consequently the Spring *An. 1. Olymp. 153*. must be *An. ante Christ. 167*. This seems the most material Passage against allowing *Herod's* Death to have been so early as 4710. because this would seem to place the taking of *Jerusalem* by *Sofius* and *Herod* in 4678. But there are so many other Passages which suppose it to have been about 2 Years higher, that they must overbear the Weight of this and of that beforementioned. And even in the Computation of these 126 Years, there seems one Reason against supposing *Jerusalem* to have been taken by *Sofius* and *Herod* so late; for *Josephus* speaking of the Death of *Antigonus* (who

was

was slain soon after the taking of *Jerusalem*) he says, *Ant. l. xiv. c. 28. Thus ended the Reign of the Asmonæans after 126 Years.* Now Dr. *Prideaux (sub An. 37.)* supposes that these Years are to be dated from the Time that *Judas Maccabæus* was established in the Government by his Peace with *Antiochus Eupator*, i. e. in the 150th Year. But it seems much more probable that *Josephus* dates 'em from the Time that *Judas* was made High Priest, upon the Death of *Alcimus*, *Antiq. l. xii. c. 17.* Herein *Josephus* differs from the Author of *1 Macc.* for he does not speak of *Judas* being High Priest, and besides, he sets the Death of *Judas* before that of *Alcimus*: Which may be the truer is uncertain, nor is it material in this Case, because as *Josephus* makes him to have been made High Priest, there is little doubt but that he dates the Reign of the *Asmonæans* from that Time. And as this was 3 Years before the Death of *Judas* (*Jos. Ant. l. xii. c. 19.*) and as his Death was about *April* in the 152d Year (*1 Macc. ix.*) therefore the Time when *Josephus* supposes *Judas* to be made High Priest, must be about *April* in the 149th Year, i. e. (as was before supposed) *A. P. J. 4551.* from whence 126 Years will reach to *April 4677.* Now the taking of *Jerusalem* by *Sofius* and *Herod* seems to have been about the latter end of *July*; for it was early in the Spring that *Herod* first besieged it, *Jos. de Bell. Jud. l. i. c. 13.* and it was taken 6 Months after, *Jos. ib. l. vi. c. 11.* The Fast-Day on which it was taken seems to be that on which the City and Temple had been destroyed by *Nebuchadnezzar*, i. e. the 10th Day of the 5th Month, *Jer. lii. 12.* And it might be about 2 Months after, that *Antigonus* was slain. The Reign of the *Asmonæans* seems not to have been full 126 Years,

because *Herod* called it 125 Years, *Jos. Ant.* l. xvii. c. 8. the Reason of which seems to be, that *Herod* dated his own Reign from the Time that he took *Jerusalem*, but *Josephus*, from the Death of *Antigonus* a few Months later. So that *Jerusalem* seems to have been taken by *Sofius* and *Herod* toward the latter part of 4676. at which Time the *Asmonæan's* Reign having been but few Months above 125 Years, *Herod* called it 125, but at the Death of *Antigonus*, it being full 125 $\frac{1}{2}$, *Josephus* called it 126. And there are several other Passages which suppose it to have been in 4676. for

3. *Josephus*, *Ant.* l. xv. c. 7. says that the Battle of *Actium* was in *Herod's* 7th Year. And *de Bell. Jud.* l. i. c. 14. he says that the Spring before this Battle was also in his 7th Year. Now this Battle was fought on *Sept.* 2. 4683. and 6 Years counted back from the Spring of this Year, reaching back to the Spring 4677. therefore *Herod's* Reign must have begun before this Time.

Josephus counts *Herod's* Years from the Death of *Antigonus*; and he being put to Death in the latter part of 4676. then the Spring 4683. was in *Herod's* 7th Year, and so was *Sept.* 2. following, tho' probably near the End of it.

4. *Josephus*, *Ant.* l. xvii. c. 15. says that in the 10th Year of *Archelaus*, the *Jews* complaining of his many Tyrannies to *Augustus*, he sent for *Archelaus*, and upon hearing their Cause, banished him into *Gallia*. And then he sent *Cyrenius* to be Governor of *Syria*, and to tax *Judæa*. And *Coponius* was also then sent to be Procurator of *Judæa*. So that it must be full 10 Years after *Herod's* Death when *Coponius* came to take Possession of *Judæa*. And after him, first *Ambripius*, and then *Rufus* (in whose Time *Augustus* died) were made Procurators of *Judæa*. And had *Herod* lived

lived to *March* 4713. (as Mr. *Lancaster* supposes) then the Time of *Coponius's* coming to the Office must have been about the middle of 4723. which was but about 4 Years before *Augustus* died; and 'tis very improbable that two of these Procurators should be removed, and another settled in the Office in the Space of 4 Years. And besides, *Josephus* *Ant.* l. xviii. c. 3. says that *Cyrenius's* taxing was but 37 Years after the Battle of *Actium*.

5. *Josephus*, *Ant.* l. xviii. c. 6. says that *Philip* (another Son of *Herod* mentioned *Luc* iii. 1.) died in the 20th Year of *Tiberius*, having for the Space of 37 Years reigned over *Trachonitis*, &c.

Now as *Tiberius's* 20th Year begun *Aug.* 19. 4746. therefore if *Herod* died in *March* 4710, and if *Philip's* Reign were but 36 Years and an half, his Death would be a Month within *Tiber.* 20.

This Passage (if there be no *erratum* in the Copies here) will undoubtedly place *Herod's* Death about this Time. And this being so little before *Josephus's* Time (for he was born but 4 Years after *Tiber.* 20.) it can hardly be thought that he should not know how long *Philip* had reigned; and as the Number of Years that *Herod* reigned are by all Men taken from *Josephus*, there is the same Reason to take from him the Number of Years that *Philip* reigned.

6. *Josephus*, *Ant.* l. xx. c. 8. says that the Time that the High Priests had exercised the Government from *Herod's* Time, until the Day that *Titus* took the City and the Temple, was 107 Years, &c. Now these Years counted back from *A. D.* 70. will reach up to *A. P.* 7. 4676.

There must surely be some Error in that Place (*Ant.* l. xiv. c. 28.) where 'tis said that there were 27 Years from the Time that *Jerusalem* was taken

taken by *Pompey*, to that of its being taken by *Sofius* and *Herod*. 'Tis true, 'tis not only here said that there were 27 Years, but 'tis also said, l. xx. c. 8. that during this Space of Time, *Hyrcanus* was High Priest 24 Years, and *Antigonus* 3 Years 3 Months. And in another place (*Ant.* l. xv. c. 9.) 'tis also said that *Hyrcanus* had been High Priest in all, for the Space of 40 Years; and yet these 40 Years can't be made out without allowing that he held the Office for 24 Years from the Time that *Pompey* took *Jerusalem*; and yet, beside the Reasons already given, there are others which shew that it could not be so much.

I doubt not but there have been some Errors committed by Transcribers, &c. in some of these Passages, as 'tis plain there has in some others. And in order to the rectifying of 'em, I esteem it material to take notice of an Instance observed by the learned Dr. *Prideaux* concerning another Error, and of the Method by which it happened, because it seems to me very probable that some Errors have crept into the Passages now before us, in the same manner as he supposes in another Case; 'tis this.

The Doctor (*sub An.* 70.) observes that *Josephus* (*Ant.* l. xiv. c. 1.) says that *Hyrcanus* began his Reign *An.* 3. *Olymp.* 177. *Q. Hortensius*, and *Q. Metellus Creticus*, being Consuls of Rome. And in another place (c. viii.) that *Pompey* took *Jerusalem* in the 179th Olympiad, *C. Antonius*, and *M. Tullius Cicero* being Consuls; and that *Pompey* then deposed *Aristobulus*, and restored *Hyrcanus*. Now 'tis said, l. xv. c. 8. that *Hyrcanus* (upon his first entering on the Government) held it only 3 Months, when his Brother *Aristobulus* dispossessed him; and 'tis said (*Ant.* l. xiv. c. 11.) that *Aristobulus* held the Government for 3 Years and 6 Months

6 Months; but l. xx. c. 8. 'tis said that he held it for 3 Years, and so many Months. Now, as the Doctor observes, the Space of Time between these 2 Consulates being full 6 Years, therefore here must have been some Error; and he supposes that in both the foresaid Places, *Josephus* had allotted to *Aristobulus* 6 Years and 6 Months. But that some Scribe had first made a casual Mistake in the former of these Places, by putting the numerical Letter for 3 instead of that for 6 before the *Years* of *Aristobulus*. And that some Critic afterwards observing this not to be consistent with the latter Place, and having not Judgment sufficient to observe where the Error was made, instead of rectifying the former place, he altered the latter, by putting the Word *Three* before the Word *Years*, in order to have it consistent with the former place. But, as the Doctor well observes, his leaving in the Words [and an equal Number of Months] and the Number of Months in the former Place being *Six*, this shews a Probability that the original Writing in the former Place was *6 Years and 6 Months*. And in the latter, *6 Years and as many Months*. This is doubtless a very reasonable Supposition.

Now it seems also, I think, very probable, that in l. xiv. c. 28. *Josephus* had made the Time between the taking of *Jerusalem* by *Pompey*, and the taking of it by *Sosius* and *Herod*, to be no more than 25 *Years*. And that in l. xx. c. 8. he had set the Continuance of *Hyrchanus's* Government, but 22 *Years*. And in l. xv. c. 9. had made all the Time of his Priesthood to be but 38 *Years*. And that some Scribe having by a casual Mistake set the numerical Letters for 27. instead of those for 25. some Critic observing that these 27 *Years* could not be made up without an Addition of

of 2 Years either to *Hyrcanus* or to *Antigonus*, he added 'em to *Hyrcanus*, i. e. in l. xx. c. 8. and then he must also think that there must be 2 Years added to him in l. xv. c. 9.

I am the rather inclined to suppose this, because (as was said) there are some other Passages which seem plainly to shew these to be Errors.

For as *Hyrcanus*, upon the Death of his Mother *Alexandra*, took the Crown *An. 3. Olymp. 177.* and held it 3 Months, and then *Aristobulus* holding it for 6 Years and 6 Months; these 6 Years and 9 Months would reach to about the beginning of *An. 2. Olymp. 179.* at which Time *Pompey* took *Jerusalem*.

Now in *Antiq. l. xiv. c. 26.* 'tis said that *Herod* was made King by the *Romans* in the 184th Olympiad. And in c. 25, 'tis said that *Hyrcanus* had been put out of the Government before *Herod* went to *Rome*. Now from the Time that *Pompey* took *Jerusalem* to the very end of *An. 4. Olymp. 184.* there were but 23 Years. So that *Hyrcanus* could not possibly hold the Government for 24 Years; and as *Antigonus* held it but 3 Years 3 Months, therefore there could not be 27 Years from the taking of *Jerusalem* by *Pompey*, to the taking of it by *Sossus* and *Herod*. And indeed it being said (*Ant. l. xiv. c. 28.*) that *Jerusalem* was taken by *Sossus* and *Herod* in the 185th Olympiad, would make one suspect that the Number 27 here is an Error, because that from the Time when *Pompey* took *Jerusalem*, to the very End of the last Year of this Olympiad there were but just 27 Years or hardly so much. Besides, it must have been before the last Year of this Olympiad, because *Herod* was made King by the *Romans* in the preceding Olympiad, and there were not quite 3 Years from his being made King by the *Romans*,

to his taking of *Jerusalem*, for he was made King in a Winter, *Ant. l. xiv. c. 25, 26.* and the Spring in which he laid Siege to *Jerusalem* was in his 3d Year from his being made King at *Rome*, *de Bell. Jud. l. i. c. 13.* and in 6 Months more the City was taken.

If it be said that in such case a Critic would rather add 2 Years to the Reign of *Antigonus*, than to that of *Hyrchanus*, because that the former is much the shorter; the Answer to this is obvious, because *Hyrchanus's* being a long Reign, and *Josephus* not distinguishing his several Years, it could not easily be judged whether his Reign were 22 or 24 Years. But it might easily be judged that *Antigonus* had not reigned 5 Years, for the Circumstances shew that he got Possession of the Kingdom but a little before *Herod* went to *Rome*; and also, that *Herod* took *Jerusalem* within 3 Years after he had been made King by the *Romans*.

'Tis true, there is some Difficulty in adjusting the Time of *Herod's* being made King at *Rome*. *Josephus* says it was in the 184th Olympiad, the last Year of which expir'd in June *A. P. J. 4674*. Now upon the Battle of *Philippi* (which was in the latter part of 4672.) *Octavianus* returning into *Italy*, *M. Antony* went into *Asia*; and after some Time he sent for *Cleopatra* Queen of *Egypt* to come to him, who, after she had staid sometime in those Parts, returned into *Egypt*, and soon after *Antony* followed her thither, and tarrying there the Winter, and hearing of the ill State of his Affairs in *Asia*, &c. and in *Italy*, early in the Spring, he sailed out of *Egypt*, and coming to *Tyre*, he there receiving heavy Complaints from his Wife *Fulvia* of her Usage from *Octavianus*, he then hastened to *Rome*, and *Fulvia* being dead before he came thither, *Octavianus* and he were soon reconciled.

ciled. It must be in the Winter 4673, that *Antony* was in *Egypt*, and one would think it should be near the middle of 4674 before he got to *Rome*. Dr. *Prideaux* supposes it was in the latter part of the Summer 4674, that *Herod* went to *Rome*; but that must be a Mistake, both because it was after the 184th Olympiad, and also because it was in the Winter that *Herod* sailed to *Rome*, *Jos. Ant.* l. xiv. c. 25. *de Bell. Jud.* l. i. c. 11. It might be in the Spring 4674. that *Herod* came to *Rome*, and 'tis possible *Antony* might come from *Egypt* so early in this Spring, and make such Expedition that he might have come to *Rome* some little time before *Herod*, and might have made Peace with *Octavianus*. *Josephus*, *Ant.* l. xiv. c. 25. says, *Herod repaired towards Rome, notwithstanding the Winter, and those grievous Troubles that at the very same Time afflicted Italy, as it was reported.* By which it would seem that the War between *Octavianus*, *Fulvia*, &c. were newly ceased when *Herod* came to *Rome*. And 'tis possible this might be something earlier in the Spring than that Time in which *Herod* laid Siege to *Jerusalem*. *Josephus*, *Ant.* l. xiv. c. 27. speaking of the Time when he first came before the City, says, *this was about the third Year after he had been declared King at Rome.* 'Tis possible his 3d Year was just begun.

But there is one good Reason for supposing that *Antony* must have arrived at *Rome* a great while before the End of *Winter*. *Plutarch* (*in vit. Anton.*) says that after he came to *Italy*, and had made Peace with *Octavianus*, he then married *Octavia* (Sister to *Octavianus*) and that after he had had a Daughter by her, he carried her with him into *Greece* and tarried all the next Winter at *Athens*.

Now supposing that it was the Middle of Win-

ter before he arrived at *Athens*, (tho' probably 'twas sooner) yet what with the 9 Months of his Wife's going with Child, and some time before she could be fit for such a Journey, and then the Journey from *Rome* to *Athens* (provided they did not tarry long by the Way) must take up a Year.

This Circumstance of *the Daughter* shews the Error of Dr. *Prideaux* who says, *Antony* staid the whole Winter at *Alexandria*, for which he refers to *Plutarch* and *Appian*; what *Appian* says I know not; *Plutarch* says he wasted Time at *Alexandria*, but don't say it was the Winter. There had passed above a Year from the Battle of *Philippi* to the Beginning of that Winter. So that he might have been at those Places, and performed those things mentioned of him, and have come to *Alexandria* before Winter. The Doctor allows he spent the next Winter at *Athens*, and therefore he could have been very little (if any) of the former Winter at *Alexandria*; for the Time of his being in *Italy*, with the Journeys, must be a full Year or more; and indeed it would seem probable that he came to *Italy* about the beginning of the Winter 4673. and *Herod* might come to *Rome* in a Month or two after, and be made King of *Judæa* by his Interest.

But still there would seem some Difficulty concerning the very Year of *Herod's* Death, because this Time of his being made King by the *Romans* would not seem to be above 3 or 4 Months before the Time of Year in which he died; for in whatever Year he died, 'tis pretty plain that his Death was but few Weeks before the Passover, *Jos. Ant.* l. xvii. c. 11. so that probably he died in *March*. And if it was in 4710. then this would not seem indeed to be above 36 Years and a few Months more, after his being made King

by the *Romans*. 'Tis probable *M. Antony* might come to *Rome* something earlier than the *Historians* speak of; and 'tis also possible that *Josephus* might something over-stretch the Reign of *Herod* from the Time of his being made King at *Rome*; for as he had said that the Time of his besieging *Jerusalem* was in his 3d Year, and as he made his Reign from the Death of *Antigonus* to be 34 Years (which seems to have been about 33 and an half) he might think it best to call his Reign from his being made King by the *Romans*, 37 Years, tho' perhaps 'twas but 3 or 4 or 5 Months above 36 Years. It seems pretty plain that either the 37 Years of *Herod's* Reign, or else the 37 Years of his Son *Philip's* Reign, must have been pretty much short of the Time; for if *Herod* lived to *March* 4711. then there were but 36 Years and 5 Months to the End of *Tiberius's* 20th Year; and 'tis very uncertain whether he might live to very near the End of *Tiberii* 20.

Any one may perceive the Reasons which induced *Dr. Prideaux* to state these Passages in the manner he has done, and so as can't be consistent with the Accounts in *Josephus*; for

1. He might suppose that there should be full 3 Years from the Time that *Herod* was made King of *Judea* by the *Romans*, to the Time that he got the Possession (as well as the Title) by the taking of *Jerusalem*, and by the Murder of *Antigonus*. But there is no Necessity for such a Supposition.

2. *Josephus* speaking of *Antigonus's* Rebellion, in order to dispossess *Hyrchanus*, says (*Ant.* l. xiv. c. 24.) that the Height of their Struggle was at the Feast of *Pentecost*, and then proceeds to relate *Herod's* Journey to *Rome*, to seek his Fortune. And (c. 27.) speaking of *Herod's* Return from *Rome*, he proceeds to relate his Wars in *Judæa* against
Antigonus,

Antigonus, that he took *Joppa*, and the Castle *Maffada*, and the Fortrefs *Ressa*, and then went to besiege *Jerusalem* in conjunction with *Silo* General of a *Roman* Army, but not succeeding there, they went and sacked *Jericho*, and then withdrew into Winter Quarters.

Now the Doctor (for the foresaid Reason, I think) sets all these Passages in the same Year, and thinks that this was the Winter next after the Pentecost before mentioned. And so the Doctor thinks that *Herod*, soon after Pentecost, went to *Rome*, and returned, (being, as he says, but 3 Months in going and coming) towards the End of Summer.

For confuting of this, 'tis sufficient that (as was said) *Josephus* says that *Herod* sailed to *Rome* in a Winter, and speaks of the Difficulties and Delays he met with in his Passage thither. And says also that before his going thither he went into *Arabia*. He staid indeed but 7 Days at *Rome*, but his Passage to and fro might probably take up near 6 Months, and the taking of those Places, and the Preparations for besieging *Jerusalem*, and the Time they lay before it, might take up a whole Summer. And indeed it would seem by this that *M. Antony* must have arrived at *Rome* about the Beginning of Winter 4673.

And the Doctor's setting the taking of *Jerusalem*, and the Death of *Antigonus* (which is *Josephus's* Date of *Herod's* Years all thro' his History) in 4677 is inconsistent with *Josephus's* Account, i. e. that the Earthquake which happened in *Judaea* in the Spring before the Battle of *Actium*, was in *Herod's* 7th Year, for by this Account it would be but his 6th Year. The Doctor indeed sets this in *An. Herod. 7.* But then it must be observed that in all the Doctor's Annals of *Herod's*

Herod's Reign, his several Years did not begin till the latter End of the respective *Julian* Years in which he places 'em ; so that by his reckoning, *Herod's* 7th Year did not begin till the latter end of the *Aetiac* Year, *i. e.* 4683. but there is little doubt but that it begun in the preceding Year. And this Battle of *Actium* being so remarkable a Time, and this Earthquake so great a one that 30,000 People were destroyed by it, the Time of it must be well known for some Ages : And this *Herod* being a great Prince, (as well as a vile Tyrant) it can't be thought but that *Josepbus* must know in what Year of *Herod* this Earthquake and this Battle happened.

There is also some Uncertainty as to the Time of Year when *Herod* laid Siege to *Jerusalem*, *i. e.* the 2d time when the City was taken. Dr. *Prideaux* supposes it to be a little before the middle of Winter. In the *Engl.* of *Josepbus*, *Ant.* l. xiv. c. 27. 'tis said, *When the Tempest was over.* In the *Jewish Wars*, l. i. c. 13. 'tis said, *The Winter being past.* The Word *χειμῶν* being used sometimes to signify, *the Winter Season*, and sometimes, *Tempestuous Weather*, and this probably being *Josepbus's* Word, might make it uncertain to the Translator ; however the Circumstances shew that it must mean, the Winter, and so Dr. *Prideaux* takes it, *Connect.* Part ii. p. 738. *Ed.* 1729. and in this very place the Doctor's Error appears concerning the Year in which *Herod* took *Jerusalem* ; for having (from p. 729.) very orderly related the Transactions of *Herod* during this Year 4675. at the end of this Summer he sends him into his Winter Quarters, and there he leaves him till the End of the next Summer ; and supposes that he having made great Preparations, did about the beginning of this Winter, lay siege to the City and took it about the Midsummer

mer following, *i. e.* 4677. The Doctor don't here say in what Time of the Year he begun the Siege, but says it lasted above half a Year, and (*sub An.* 63.) he says that *Pompey* took *Jerusalem* about Midsummer; and *Herod* took it on the same Day of the Month.

Now this Account is contrary to *Josephus*, for he (*Antiq.* l. xiv. c. 27. and *de Bell. Jud.* l. i. c. 13.) having mentioned *Herod's* Success in his Wars in *Galilee*, says that he had then gone directly to *Jerusalem* and taken the City, but that he was hindered by bad Weather; but that when the tempestuous (or Winter) Weather was over he went and besieged it, and (*De Bell. Jud.* l. vi. c. 11.) took it in 6 Months. So that 'tis plain that *Herod* besieged *Jerusalem* as soon as this Winter was over. And that this Winter was *A. P.* 4675—6 is plain from hence, *viz.* that the Battle gained by *Ventidius* over the *Parthians* (in which *Pacorus* the King's Son was slain) was on the same Day of the Month just 14 Years after that the *Parthians* had gained as signal a Victory over the *Romans* under *Crassus* at the Battle of *Carrhæ*; and this Battle being in *June* 4661. therefore the Victory over the *Parthians* was gained by *Ventidius* in *June* 4675. see *Dr. Prideaux sub. An.* 39.

Now *Josephus* (*Ant.* l. xiv. c. 27. *De Bell. Jud.* l. i. c. 12.) says that as soon as this Battle was over, *Ventidius*, (by *Antony's* Order) sent *Machæra* a Roman General into *Judæa* to assist *Herod* in his War against *Antigonus*, but he (as well as *Silo* who had been sent before) acted his Part so deceitfully between *Antigonus* and *Herod*, in order to draw Money from both, that *Herod* took a Journey to *Antony* (who was then besieging *Samosata*) to complain of *Machæra*, and there he staid.

staid and assisted *Antony* in the Siege, and when the Place was surrendered, *Antony* ordered *Sosius* to go and assist *Herod*; and he sending some Forces, staid behind to attend on *Syria*, &c. over which *Antony* had made him Governor; but after some time, came himself into *Judæa* with numerous Forces to assist *Herod* in taking *Jerusalem*.

And *Herod* having parted from *Antony*, in his way homeward heard of the ill Success of his Brother *Joseph*, who had been slain in *Galilee* and most of the Forces under him; upon this, *Herod* hastened thither, and raising what Forces he could both *Jews* and *Romans*, he overcame that Party who had conquered *Joseph*, and slew *Pappus* their General, took several Places, making great Slaughter; and would then have marched directly to *Jerusalem*, but that it being Winter Season he was forced to wait till Spring, and then he laid siege to the City, and in about a Month, *Sosius* came with a large Army to his Assistance, and in 5 Months more they took it.

What makes this Matter still more probable is, that it appears that *Antony* came this Summer into *Syria*, and then no doubt it was that he put *Antigonus* to Death at *Antioch*; for when he withdrew from *Samofata*, which was in the latter part of Summer 4675. he then went to *Athens*, and thence to *Brundisium*, and presently back again to *Athens*, and then went and spent the Winter at *Alexandria*, (see Dr. *Prideaux* sub *An.* 39. *Jos. Ant.* l. xiv. c. 27.) The next Spring he went to *Athens*, and thence (with his Wife *Octavia*) to *Tarentum* in *Italy* with 300 Sail of Ships, where *Octavianus* met him; and there *Octavia* pacified some Bickerings between 'em, and then *Antony* went with an Army into *Syria* (see Dr. *Prid.* sub *An.* 38. *Plutarch* in *Anton.*) *Plutarch* speaking of this

this coming of *Antony* into *Syria*, then mentions his beheading of *Antigonus* King of *Judaea*.

Therefore *Sofius* and *Herod* must have taken *Jerusalem* sometime in the Summer 4676. and not very long after that, *Antigonus* was put to Death. And therefore the foresaid Places must have been Errors by Scribes. If the *Engl.* Translators have followed the Method of the *Greec* Copies in this Matter, then the Number 27 in *Ant.* l. xiv. c. 28. must there have been in numerical Letters, for here 'tis 27 in Figures, and Transcribers are much more apt to commit Errors in such Cases than in whole Words. But in l. xv. c. 9. and in l. xx. c. 8. the 40 Years, and the 24 Years of *Hyrcanus* are in Words at length, but they (as was said) must have been designed Emendations. And this is just the same Case as that which Dr. *Prideaux* supposes, with regard to the Years of *Aristobulus* as beforementioned.

And it seems probable that there has been another Emendation made in this very place l. xiv. c. 28. where 'tis said that *Sofius* and *Herod* took *Jerusalem* in the 3d Month. It can hardly mean the 3d *Jewish* Month, because as the Siege continued 6 Months, then it must have begun in the 9th Month which was in, or before, the Depth of Winter. Neither is there, I think, any Account of any Fast being kept in the 3d Month. The Case I take to be thus. 'Tis said (*De Bell. Jud.* l. vi. c. 11.) that *Pompey* besieged *Jerusalem* 3 Months; and that *Herod* besieged it 6 Months. Now in *Ant.* l. xiv. c. 8. 'tis said that *Pompey* took the Temple in the 3d Month, which must here mean, the 3d Month of the Siege. That it can't mean the 3d Month of their Year, is plain, because 'tis said, c. 5. that *Pompey* cited *Hyrcanus* and *Aristobulus* to attend him at *Damascus* in the Spring,

P

and

and after they had met him, it was some Time before he besieged *Jerusalem*; so that 3 Months after the Time the City was besieged must reach down a good deal below the 3d *Jewish* Month. Now I suppose *Josephus* had said that *Sofius* and *Herod* took *Jerusalem* in the 6th Month, meaning, *The 6th of the Siege*, and, that some Critic observing this, and that they took it on the same Day of the Month that *Pompey* had taken it; and also finding it said that *Pompey* took it in the 3d Month, he supposed it to mean the third Month of the Year, and so altered the latter place thinking to make it agree with the former. I only mention this Instance to shew a Probability that some such things have been done in the Works of *Josephus*. And I wish I may not have Occasion (before I have finished this mean Performance) to make the like Observation with regard to a Book of much higher Authority.

Sir Isaac Newton seems also, I think, to have mistaken the Time of *Herod's* Reign. For he says, (*Chron. c. vi.*) that those *Jews* who took *Herod* for the Messiah seem to have grounded their Opinion on the 70 Weeks of Years which they found between the Reign of *Cyrus* and that of *Herod*. By this he seems to mean that *Herod* took *Jerusalem*, *A. P. J.* 4678. and that there were 500 Years from *Cyrus's* Decree (4178.) to this Time. So that he seems to have mistaken the Number of Years in *Daniel's* 70 Weeks, and also the Time of *Herod's* Reign.

Upon the whole, and by comparing all Circumstances in this Case, the Matter seems to be thus, viz.

That about *April An. i. Olymp. 179. (Per. Jul. 4651.) Pompey* besieged *Jerusalem*, and took it in 3 Months; and *Hyrcanus* being then restored to the

the Kingdom, he held it near 22 Years, till Pentecost *A. P. J.* 4673. (*Jos. Ant.* l. xiv. c. 23.) Then in the beginning of the next Winter *Herod* went to *Rome*, and was there by the Senate declared King of *Judæa* about the latter end of this Year, and in a little more than 2 Years he besieged *Jerusalem*, and took it about *July* 4676. after *Antigonus* had been King about 3 Years and 3 Months (*Jos. Ant.* l. xx. c. 8.) and 2 or 3 Months after, *Antigonus* was put to Death; then began *Herod's* Reign.

In the 30th Year of his (*Herod's*) Reign, *Augustus* issued out a Decree for taking a Description, or Enrollment of the People in his Empire (*Luc* ii.) this Decree was passed in the Consulship of *C. Marcius Censorinus*, and *C. Asinius Gallus*, *A. P. J.* 4706. (see *Dr. Prideaux sub An.* 5.) whereon Orders being forthwith sent to all Governors of the *Roman* Provinces, one of which was *Saturninus* then Governor of *Syria*; he having in about 2 Years finished this Affair in many places, he then ordered that all Persons belonging to *Bethlehem* in *Judæa*, should come thither to have their Names, &c. registered. The Virgin *Mary*, and *Joseph* her Husband being Descendants from *David*, and *Bethlehem* being *David's* City, they came up from their Dwelling (*Nazareth* in *Galilee*) in order to be enrolled at *Bethlehem*; but before they could be dispatched, *Mary's* full Time came to be delivered. Then (about the latter end of *A. P. J.* 4708.) was born our Lord and Saviour Christ. This was a little within *Herod's* 33d Year.

About the same time, but at a great Distance, a Star appeared to some Wise-Men or *Magi*, and by some Token or Revelation, they understood that this miraculous Star did portend the Birth of some

wonderful Person in *Judæa* ; whereupon they resolve to undertake a Journey to adore, and offer Presents to him ; but it being a long Journey and the Winter Season, 'tis probable they would not set out till the Dead of Winter was over ; then setting out, they in some Months arrived at *Jerusalem*, and made Enquiry, *Where is he that is born, King of the Jews? &c.* and the Rumour thereof coming to *Herod*, he was jealous lest this Person should come to dispossess his Posterity of the Kingdom ; for he could hardly think to live himself to see any Person then newly born, arrive to Man's Age, he being near 70 Years old ; and considering the Circumstances, he judged that this must be the Messiah, who was then generally expected ; and according to the Notion prevailing among the *Jews*, he supposed that Christ was to exercise a glorious temporal Kingdom ; he by a wicked Intent (suitable to his Nature, as appears by most of the Actions of his Life) presently laid a Design to cut off this new-born King. A little after this, *Varus* (who had been sent by *Augustus* to succeed *Saturninus*) being at *Jerusalem*, *Herod* desired his Assistance to sit in Judgment on his Son *Antipater*, who had laid a Plot to poison his Father, the sooner to possess his Kingdom (for *Herod* had by Will made him his Heir) and he being found guilty *Herod* imprisoned him, but before he would put him to Death, sent an Embassy to *Augustus* to know his Pleasure therein ; and a while after *Herod* fell sick, and in a few Months his Messengers returned from *Rome* with Letters from *Augustus* who left it to *Herod* to deal by his Son as he thought proper, and in a short time he ordered him to be executed. Then he altered his Will, dividing his Kingdom among 3 other Sons, viz. *Archelaus* (named *Mat. ii.*)

Herod

Herod and *Philip* (named *Luc* iii.) and in 5 Days after *Antipater* was put to Death : *Herod* himself died in the Spring, *A. P.* 7. 4710.

The Circumstances shew that our Saviour was born at least a Year before *Herod's* Death. The sailing of *Herod's* Messengers to, and from, *Rome* must take up several Months, it being Winter Time ; and how long *Varus* had been in *Syria* before that time of his coming to *Jerusalem* is uncertain ; only one may judge by one Expression in *Josephus*, that he had been there some considerable Time ; for he says, *Antiq.* l. xvii. c. 7. that when the Tryal of *Antipater* was over, *Varus* went the next Day to *Antioch*, where he used for the most part to reside, it being the chief City, &c. and 'tis probable that our Saviour had been born sometime before *Varus* came into the Office ; for 'tis like that *Saturninus* might continue in it till the Registering was finished, and 'tis not very probable that *Bethlehem* should be the last Place at which it was made. Dr. *Prideaux* who (as he says) follows Archbishop *Usher* in most Matters, must think it necessary to differ from him in this Case, *i. e.* either to set the Birth of Christ one Year back, or else, to remove the Death of *Herod* one Year lower ; because the setting the Birth of Christ but about 3 Months before *Herod's* Death can't consist with Reason ; but then he seems not to have taken the most reasonable of the two, for by most of the Circumstances, it appears probable that *Herod* died about the Time here mentioned.

The Doctor does not give his Opinion of the Meaning of the Words *Luc* iii. 23. and in what Year he supposes Christ to be baptized ; but 'tis probable he might be of the Opinion with Bishop *Usher* and many others, *i. e.* that St. *Luc* had said that

that Christ was not full thirty when he was baptized, and so might think that Christ was not born before the Year 4709. because then he would have been full 30 when *John* began baptizing. So that the Explanation of the Words *Luc* iii. 23. as given by Dr. *Wall*, is of good use; for it will allow the Birth of Christ to have been one Year sooner, and his Baptism 3 Years later than where Bishop *Usher* placed 'em, and this, without going into the Opinion of those learned Men (Mr. *Lancaster*, Mr. *Marshall*, &c.) i. e. that St. *Luc*'s 15th Year of *Tiberius* was his 15th from the Death of *Augustus*. And indeed when this Matter had been well cleared by Bishop *Usher*, &c. and thereby a great Difficulty removed, 'tis much that any one should go about to renew and maintain an old Difficulty; since every Reader may see that this their Account is inconsistent with Scripture; for whatever may be said concerning the Time of Christ's Birth, and of *Herod*'s Death, and in whatever Way the Words *Luc* iii. 23. be taken, yet it must be supposed that *John* began his Ministry a few Years before our Saviour himself entered on his Ministry, which could not be without allowing that *John* began his Ministry about *A. D.* 26. which Year (all before *Aug.* 19.) was but the 12th of *Tiberius* counting from the Death of *Augustus*. For as our Blessed Saviour was crucified at the Passover *A. D.* 33. and as St. *John* mentions 4 Passovers during Christ's Ministry, therefore there is a Necessity to suppose that his Ministry begun before the Passover *A. D.* 30. and as the 15th of *Tiberius*'s Empire begun *Aug.* 19. *A. D.* 28. therefore by their Account, the utmost Time to be allowed between the Beginning of *John*'s, and the Beginning of Christ's Ministry, is only one Year and a few Months.

Months. And what is the more absurd in this Matter, is, that they do also cut off the one Year, by bringing back Christ's Ministry a Year above the true time, and so do allow only the few odd Months. This seems (as was said) to be a settling of these Passages so as to suit an Hypothesis, rather than endeavouring to shew the several Passages of Scripture to be consistent one with the other. A few Months (nor one Year and a few Months) was not a Time sufficient for *John* to have preached the Baptism of Repentance to all the People of Israel (*Acts* xiii. 24.) and to have baptized all the People (*Luc* iii. 21.) and to have prepared the Way of the Lord in such manner as is mentioned, *Is.* xl. 3, 4, &c. *Mal.* iv. 5, 6.



S E C T. III.

Of the Time when John Baptist began to Preach and Baptize.

Concerning this Matter, I have nothing farther to offer than what I have said before, *i. e.* in relation to the last Week in *Daniel's* Prophecy, to which I refer the Reader, and shall here (as I there said) conclude it, as most probable, that *John* began his Preaching, &c. sometime about the middle of *A. D.* 26. *Per. Jul.* 4739.

SECT.



S E C T. IV.

Of the Time of Christ's Baptism.

HERE the Reader will, I think, see one great Reason to conclude that the *English*, and other, Translators have not given a proper rendering of the Words, *Luc* iii. 23. he having, v. 1. said, *In the 15th Year of the Reign* (Government) *of Tiberius Cæsar—the Word of God came unto John, &c.* he then proceeds to relate the Preaching and Baptizing by *John*; and then v. 21. relates the Baptism of Christ by him: And then subjoins, v. 23. (according to the *Eng.*) *And Jesus himself began to be about 30 Years of Age.* Now as these Words stand in the *English*, they don't directly specify any *Time* when *Jesus* began to be about 30. Yet as they are immediately subjoined to those which relate the Baptism of our Saviour, it has been generally supposed that *St. Luc's* Meaning was, that *Jesus* began to be (*i. e.* was near) 30 at his Baptism. From what has been said, it appears that there were 29 Years and 3 Months between the Death of *Herod*, and the Calling of *John*: And if it were supposed that *Jesus* wanted but one Month of being 30 when he was baptized, there would then be but 8 Months to be allowed, both for the Space between the Birth of Christ and the Death of *Herod*; and also for that between the Calling of *John* and the Baptism of Christ; and yet 'tis ve-

ry plain that 8 Months are not sufficient in either of the Cases. Concerning the Time of Christ's Birth I have spoken already. That there was a considerable Space of Time between the Calling of *John* and his baptizing of Christ, is plain from several Texts of Scripture, *Matt. iii. 5, 6. Marc i. 5. Luc iii. 3—21.* See *Dr. Wall's Def. p. 300.* Whoever observes what had been foretold by the Prophets, concerning the Preparation that *John* should make for the Messiah, and also observes what is here spoken by the Evangelists, will readily suppose that there were not only a few Months, but a few Years, between the Calling of *John* and the Baptism of Christ. Beside the Unreasonableness of supposing that *John* could have preached to, and baptized such Multitudes in so short a Time, there is also another Circumstance as improbable, which necessarily follows from such a Supposition, viz. that Christ lived a private Life for 3 Years after his Baptism; (for there are plain Proofs (besides *Daniel's* Prophecy) that there were about 3 Years and an half from the Calling of *John*, to the Beginning of Christ's Ministry.) *Dr. Wall, Def. p. 296.* says that this was supposed by *Bishop Usher*: and the Doctor here says, it is a very probable Supposition. This he spoke, because, as was said, he had not then a right Conception of the Words *Luc iii. 23.* This seems suitable neither to the Nature of the Case, nor to the Accounts given by the Evangelists; for it may reasonably be supposed that the Baptism and Temptation of our Blessed Saviour were as immediate Preparatives to his sacred Ministry: and when he was in so transcendent a manner, endowed with the Power and Graces of the Holy Spirit, 'tis no ways probable that he did, after that, continue to live a private Life for 3 Years.

St. *Luc* having related the Baptism of Christ, and the Descent of the Holy Spirit on him, says c. iv. 1. *And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the Wilderness, &c.* and v. 14. *Jesus returned in the Power of the Spirit into Galilee, and there went out a Fame of him, &c.* It can't be thought that our Saviour then returned *in the Power of the Spirit* into *Galilee*, in order to spend there 3 Years in a private Life. When he here says, *Jesus returned, &c. and there went out a Fame, &c.* 'Tis evident that this Fame was from the Miracles which Christ then began to do. Nor can it with any Reason, be supposed that this Return into *Galilee* was 3 Years after Christ's Baptism: And indeed, 'tis plain that all 3 Evangelists do join pretty close, the Fasting to the Baptism, and the Beginning of the Ministry to the Fasting.

Dr. *Hammond*, Note on *John* i. f. supposes that our Saviour, as soon as he had ended his Fasting and Temptation, returned to *John Baptist*, and it is manifestly a very probable Supposition, by comparing this Place in St. *John*, with the History of the Three concerning Christ's Baptism, &c. and his Return into *Galilee*; and 'tis evident from *Marc* i. 12. &c. that the Temptation immediately followed the Baptism; and 'tis also plain from St. *John*, c. i. and ii. that, very soon after this returning to *John Baptist*, Christ entered on his Ministry, for he then called some Disciples, returned into *Galilee*, wrought the Miracle in *Cana*, &c. This Opinion of the Doctor (in which he seems to have judged very rightly) does intirely cut off that Conjecture of Archbishop *Usher*, that Christ lived a private Life for 3 Years after his Baptism, for here is no room for it.

The

The Reason of Bishop *Usher* for placing the Baptism so early, is obvious: For he, supposing St. *Luc* to have said that *Jesus* began to be about 30 at his Baptism, and finding that he was born for some time before *Herod's* Death; and also finding that there were near 30 Years between the Death of *Herod* and the Calling of *John Baptist*, he must thence think there was a Necessity to suppose that Christ was baptized very soon after the Calling of *John*: and then indeed the necessary Consequence is, that Christ did live a private Life, for 3 Years after his Baptism. But this new Construction of St. *Luc's* Words, does intirely remove that Necessity which led the Bishop into this improbable Conjecture. Concerning Dr. *Wall's* Opinion in this Matter (Note on *Luc* iv. 14.) see what was said above at p. 1, &c.

It seems most reasonable to suppose that the Baptism of Christ was about two Months before the Beginning of his Ministry; and as 'tis very probable that his Ministry begun at such Time as had been foretold by the Prophecy of *Daniel*, i. e. half a Week, or 3 lunar Years and an half, before his Passion; and as this half-week begun about the Beginning of *November, A. D. 29. Per. Jul. 4742.* therefore 'tis probable that the Baptism might be in, or about *September, A. D. 29.* And by this Time *John Baptist* had continued baptizing for something more than 3 Years; and this Space of time seems to be required.

St. *Luc* c. iii. 21. says, *Now when all the People were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also, &c.* tho' these Words are not to be taken so strictly as to think that *John* gave over baptizing as soon as Christ was baptized by him; because it will appear from St. *John* that he continued baptizing for about, or above, a Year longer,

i. e. above a Year after the Time in which Christ is here supposed to be baptized : yet the least that can be meant by these Words of St. *Luc*, is, I think, that *John* had baptized much the greater part of those who were baptized by him ; and as his whole time of baptizing lasted above 4 Years, one may well think that he had continued above 3 Years in baptizing before Christ was baptized by him.



S E C T. V.

Of the Time when our Blessed Saviour himself began his sacred Ministry, of Preaching, working Miracles, &c.

I just now supposed that Christ began his Ministry about the beginning of *November A. D.* 29. Beside that the Prophecy of *Daniel* has made this Matter more than probable, it will also appear probable from the Evangelists that our Saviour did begin his Ministry about this Time, when they are rightly compared, and all Circumstances considered. St. *John* (the only Evangelist that does directly mention the several Passovers in the Time of Christ's Ministry) does indeed give a very small Account of Miracles, &c. as done by our Saviour before the first Passover, c. ii. 13. only of his calling some Disciples, and of the first Miracle in *Cana* : But 'tis very probable that St. *John* did here (as 'tis plain he does at some other Places) pass over a good Space of Time,

Time, in which many Preachings were delivered, Miracles wrought, &c. by Christ in *Galilee*, they having been fully related by the Three.

But the Reasons for shewing the Probability of this, I shall have Occasion to bring under the next Head, to which I refer the Reader, and shall here suppose it as most probable, that Christ's Ministry begun about the Time before mentioned.



S E C T. VI.

Of the Time when John Baptist was imprisoned.

IT may be said that this is a Case not very material to speak to. I own that it is, in itself, a Matter of no great Moment, to know just the Time when he was imprisoned. But then, 'tis a Matter of no small Moment, to shew a Probability that the Evangelists themselves have not related this Case with any Difference.

I say, *themselves*, because as the Case now stands in our Copy (and so I doubt not, it is in all Copies extant) there seems a Difference too great to be reconciled; but when all Circumstances are considered, I doubt not but there will appear a good Probability to suppose that some Words have been inserted into *Matt. iv. 12.* and *Marc i. 14.* by some officious Scribes in the very early times.

The Reader will excuse me if I use a little Length of Words on this Occasion, because it would seem to me (from the few Commentators that

that I have seen, and from the marginal Reference at *Matt. iv. 12.*) some question whether this Matter have yet been rightly explained.

Of the Time when *John Baptist* was imprisoned, there can be no great Question. *St. John, c. ii. 13.* having said that *Jesus* went up to *Jerusalem* at the Passover, (which was *April, A. D. 30.*) and having related what was done by our Saviour at *Jerusalem*, he subjoins, *c. iii. 22. &c. After these things came Jesus and his Disciples into the Land of Judæa, and there he tarried with them and baptized. And John also was baptizing, &c.—For John was not yet cast into Prison.* How long this tarrying was, and how long it was after this, that *John* was imprisoned, is not said; but as it will appear that *Jesus* did tarry about 9 Months in *Judæa* at this Time, and as it will also appear probable that *John* was imprisoned, either a little before, or a little after, *Jesus* came out of *Judæa*, therefore the most probable time to suppose for *John's* Imprisonment, is, sometime about the end of *A. D. 30.* or in the beginning of 31.

That our Saviour did tarry so long in *Judæa*, is plain, from some Words in his Discourse to his Disciples, while he was in *Samaria*, in his Passage into *Galilee*. See *Dr. Wall's* Note on *John iv. 35.* 'Tis plain that the Doctor's Explanation is proper; for these Words of our Saviour are doubtless to be taken in a literal Sense, in respect of the natural Harvest, unto which there were, it seems, then 4 Months: And as their Harvest (the Barley-harvest) always began about the middle of *Nisan* the first Month, (for it was always ready at the Passover which was kept at that time.) Therefore according to our way of reckoning, this time should have been much about 4 Months before the Passover; but as the constant Method
with

with the *Jews*, in numbering of Days, was to count the first and the last, so there is little doubt but that they did the same in numbering of Months; and therefore this must be supposed to have been sometime in the 10th Month which usually begun about the middle of *December*. And so it is (as the Doctor here says) uncertain whether it were in *December*, *A. D.* 30. or *January*, 31. If it were about the middle of the 10th Month, then it would be just 3 whole Months before the Passover:

There is no doubt but that this was the first Time that *Jesus* returned into *Galilee* after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment (if *John* was then imprisoned, which is far from being certain) for St. *John* had before said, that *Jesus* tarried in *Judæa*, and then *John* was not imprisoned; so that there is no room for supposing that *Jesus* should (after this tarrying, and after *John* was imprisoned) return into *Galilee*, and then come back again into *Judæa*, before that return into *Galilee*, *John* iv. 3—43.

Now this Account of St. *John* is difficult (and, I think, impossible) to be reconciled with that of the Three, viz. *Matt.* iv. 12. *Marc* i. 14. *Luc* iv. 14. I mention St. *Luc*, because tho' he does not here say that this Return into *Galilee* was after the Imprisonment of *John Baptist*, yet 'tis evident that the Three do here all mean the same Return; for they do all mention the very same things as then done, in several Instances; for tho' St. *Luc* here inverts the Order of Time, by relating first the Passages at *Nazareth*, yet his own Words shew his Meaning to be that Christ had (upon this coming into *Galilee*) first been at *Caper-naum*, &c. and done those things which are here related by the other two, *Luc* iv. 15. 23. See Dr. Wall on v. 23. The

The Doctor does indeed suppose that *St. Luc.* v. 33. recites those things which in v. 23. he had (by reciting our Saviour's Saying) supposed to have been before done at *Capernaum*; but upon comparing, 'twill appear that the Case is not so, for that going to *Capernaum*, *Luc* iv. 31. was a second going, and so also, was that in *Marc* i. 21. and not the same with that in *Matt.* iv. 13. but the same with that in *Matt.* viii. 5. as will fully appear by what will be said towards the End of this Discourse. Those things which *St. Luc.* c. iv. 23. supposes to have been done at *Capernaum*, must have been done upon Christ's going thither, *Matt.* iv. 13. &c.

My Reasons for supposing that the Three do not here mean any Return of our Saviour into *Galilee*, after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment, are these.

1. I can see no reason why (as I said before) it should not be thought that our Blessed Saviour did begin his Ministry at such Time as had been foretold by the Prophecy. For (as *Dr. Prideaux, Connect.* p. 286. in almost the very same Case, does well argue) "No Word of God is
" given in vain; every part of it hath its Signi-
" ficancy, and every Word of Prophecy therein
" contained must have its Completion. For,
" &c. — And therefore every part of the last
" Week of this Prophecy, *i. e.* the last half part,
" as well as the first, must have its Significancy
" and also its Completion, &c." The *Engl.* at *Dan.* ix. 27. says, *In the midst of the Week he shall cause, &c.* But *Dr. Prid.* p. 293. says it should be, *In the half part*: And so doubtless, the Meaning is, *i. e.* the latter half. And there is no one who rightly considers this Matter, but will, I think, suppose that the Ministry of Christ began for half a Week before his Passion.

Lunar

Lunar Years we have supposed 'em to be, and therefore this half Week would begin almost 5 Months before the first Passover, mentioned *John* ii. 13. Now if Christ began his Ministry for near 5 Months before this Passover; as it would not be reasonable to think that the Three pass over in silence, not only those 9 Months which Christ tarried in *Judæa*, after the Passover (for those 'tis plain they do pass over) but also these 5 Months which Christ tarried in *Galilee* before the Passover, and not begin their History of Christ's Miracles, &c. till one third part of the Time of his Ministry was over. So also 'tis reasonable to suppose that St. *John* would have given a larger Account of what was done by our Saviour in *Galilee*, during these 5 Months, had he not observed that the Three had given a full History of it. This seems to make it very probable that St. *John* (when he says, c. ii. 12, 13. *He went down to Capernaum, he and &c.—and they continued there not many Days. And the Jews Passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem*) did here, (between v. 12. and v. 13.) pass over some Months which were spent in Preaching, doing Miracles, &c. in *Galilee*. It may be observed that this is no other Method than what he uses upon Christ's 2d coming into *Galilee*, for he having, c. iv. mentioned this Return into *Galilee*, and the Cure of the Nobleman's Son; the next thing he mentions is, Christ's going up to *Jerusalem*, c. v. 1. and yet there were (as was before said) about 3 Months between Christ's Return into *Galilee*, and this 2d Passover, *John* v. 1.

This will, I think, appear farther probable, by observing the Method and Order of St. *Matthew's* History. Whoever compares St. *Matthew* with St. *John*, and observes where the 3 last Passovers do come in in each of 'em (allowing that

Matthew did pass over all the Passages in *Judæa*, till the last time of Christ's going thither : And, that *John* did pass over most of the Passages in *Galilee*,) will, I think, plainly see that they do observe Order of Time ; and there is good Reason to suppose they should, writing by Memory. Now as to the former part of *Matt. i. e.* from c. iv. 12. to c. ix. 9. he must have been sensible whether the Passages here related did, or did not, occur before the Time that he was himself called : and it can't be thought that he would set down any of these things before he mentioned the calling of himself, if he knew 'em to have been done afterwards ; and his Words do also shew that what follows from this Place, to c. xii. is delivered in a Chronological Order. Now c. xii. 1. he says, *At that time Jesus went, on the Sabbath Day, thro' the Corn, &c.* Now this was the same Sabbath which *St. Luc*, c. vi. 1. calls σαββατον δευτερον πρωτον, i. e. the first Sabbath after the second Day of the Passover ; and this was the same Passover with that, *John* v. 1. See *Dr. Wall* on these Texts. It will not be counted the first, because that was a good while before *John* was imprisoned ; it can't be the third, because that comes in, c. xiv. compared with *John* vi. It was before shewn that the first Time that *Jesus* returned into *Galilee*, after the Imprisonment of *John Baptist*, was but about 3 Months before this 2d Passover. Therefore if *St. Matthew* at c. iv. 12. did mean any Return into *Galilee* after *John Baptist*'s Imprisonment, then it must be supposed that the Passages which he has related, from c. iv. 12. to c. xii. were all transacted in the Space of 3 Months ; now this does not seem at all probable. *St. Matthew*, beside all other particular Passages which he relates, said twice, in this part of his History, That *Jesus went about*
all

all Galilee; about all the Cities and Villages, &c. c. iv. 23. c. ix. 35. Moreover, if this must be allowed, then it is plain that *Peter, Andrew, James and John*, (*Matt. iv. 18.*) were called but very few Months before the second Passover, (which is inconvenient to suppose, in many Respects.) And then it can hardly be thought that *Matthew* was called before this second Passover; for 'tis plain that he was not called till some considerable time after the others; see c. iv. 23, to ix. 9. Now this does not seem very consistent with other Places in *St. Matthew*; for, between the Calling of himself, c. ix. 9. and the 2d Passover, c. xii. 1. he has related several Passages, which must take up a considerable Space, that were transacted in the intermediate time, see c. ix. 35.

2. *St. Luc, Acts i. 21, 22.* recites these Words of *St. Peter*, *Of these Men who have companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the Baptism of John, &c.* And c. x. 39. *We are Witnesses of all things which he did, both in the Land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem, &c.* This would seem to shew that *Peter, &c.* were called a good while before the Imprisonment of *John Baptist*. Called, I mean, to be constant Followers of Christ; for tho' *Peter, &c.* did come to Christ while he was with *John Baptist*, *John i.* yet they did not forsake all to follow him, till he called 'em from Fishing, *Matt. iv. 18.* See *Dr. Hammond*, on *Acts i. 21.* the Doctor here makes *Matt. iv. 12.* and *John i. 43.* to be parallel, contrary to what he had said on *Matt. iv. 12.* see also *Dr. Whitby* in his P. S. to his *Pref. to St. John's Gospel.* Both of these learned Men do suppose that *St. Peter*, by those Words (beginning from the Baptism of *John*) does refer to the Time when Christ

was baptized by *John*. Now it will not be accounted reasonable that *St. Peter* should say, that those Men had accompanied him, and other of the Apostles, in their following of Christ, all the Time of his Ministry, beginning from the Time of his Baptism [or, suppose, from the end of his fasting] provided that *Peter*, &c. had not been called to be Followers of Christ till a Year or more, after his Baptism and Temptation.

3. *St. Luc*, in *Pref.* to his Gospel, and to *Acts* says, *Even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were Eye-Witnesses, &c.—having had perfect Understanding of all things from the very first, &c.* and, that he had written, *Of all things which Jesus began both to do and to teach, &c.* It is not probable that *St. Luc* (and consequently, *Matthew* and *Marc*) did pass over any considerable Time in Christ's Ministry. This I speak on condition the Reader be satisfied that Christ began his Ministry a good while before the first Passover; for 'tis plain that the Three do pass over those 9 Months that Christ tarried in *Judæa*.

4. 'Tis pretty plain that the Three do not here mean the same Return into *Galilee* with that in *John* iv. because *St. Matthew* does here (c. iv. 13.) say that *Jesus* then came and dwelt in *Capernaum*. Now *St. John*, c. iv. 46. says that *Jesus* then came to *Cana*. At that first Return into *Galilee*, c. i. 43. *St. John* does say, c. ii. 12. that *Jesus* did then go to *Capernaum*. And tho' *St. John* do not speak of Christ's dwelling at *Capernaum*, as *St. Matthew* does, yet that is of no force at all against taking 'em to be both the same going to *Capernaum*, because there is, as was before said, no reason to suppose the contrary but that *St. John* did here pass over a good Space of Time; besides, both by the Nature of the Case, and from the

the Sequel here in *St. Matthew*, 'tis not probable that *Jesus* did then tarry long in *Capernaum*, but went about the Villages, Preaching, &c.

5. *St. Matthew* having here mentioned Christ's Return into *Galilee*, he subjoins, *v. 17. From that Time Jesus began to Preach, &c.* any one would, from these Words, naturally conclude that *St. Matthew* did here refer to the Time when Christ entered on his Ministry: So *Dr. Hammond* takes it; but then this can't agree with what he had said just before, *viz. at v. 12.* any Expositor must, I think, be inconsistent with himself, who explains *Matt. iv. 12.* as it now stands. The same may be observed with regard to the Words, *Marc i. 14.* and *Luc iv. 14.* whoever observes these Words, with the preceding Passages, would reasonably conclude that they do here refer to the Time when Christ entered on his Ministry. For when *St. Luc* had said that at Christ's Baptism, the Holy Spirit descended on him, and that *Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost—was led by the Spirit into the Wilderness.* And then subjoins, *And Jesus returned in the Power of the Spirit into Galilee, &c.* It may reasonably be supposed that he did here mean the first Return that Christ made into *Galilee*, after his Baptism and Temptation; for it can't be so reasonably thought that he did here mean any Return into *Galilee* that was a Year after Christ's Baptism, as it must be (probably more) if it was after *John Baptist* was imprisoned. *Dr. Hammond* paraphrases these Words, *Jesus being, by the powerful Incitation of the Spirit of God, now stired up to set upon his prophetic Office, returned, &c.* And the same Reason induced the Doctor to paraphrase *Marc i. 14.* (where the Imprisonment of *John* is prefixed to Christ's Return into *Galilee.*) *Soon after this, Herod, having, &c.*
The

The Doctor here paraphrased according to the obvious Meaning of the Places, and the Nature of the Case ; not observing, as I suppose, that it appears from *St. John* that *John Baptist* was not imprisoned till 8 or 10. (more probably 12 or 15.) Months after Christ's Temptation.

Some learned Expositors do suppose (from the Prophecy of *Isaiab*, c. ix.) that the People of *Galilee*, about *Capernaum*, &c. were to be the first who should have the *Light* and Benefit of Christ's Presence and Preaching. See Mr. *Mede* on that Prophecy, and Dr. *Hammond*, *Annot. on Matt.* iv. d. And what is remarkable to this Purpose, is, that *St. Matthew* does here apply the fulfilling of this Prophecy, to the Effects of Christ's then coming to *Capernaum*, &c.

Now this makes one good Reason for supposing that Christ's Return into *Galilee*, *Matt.* iv. 12. was not after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment ; for if it were, then 'tis plain by *St. John*, that Christ had been preaching in *Judæa* for about 9 Months before his coming to *Capernaum*, *Matt.* iv.

It may indeed be said, that *St. John*, c. ii. 13. had spoke of Christ's going to *Capernaum* before his going up to *Jerusalem*. That is undoubted. But then, if *St. John's* Words here be taken in a strict Sense, *i. e.* that Christ, upon his leaving *Capernaum* (having continued there not many Days) did go directly up to *Jerusalem* ; this don't well comport with *Isaiab's* Prophecy ; and therefore 'tis very reasonable to suppose the going to *Capernaum*, *Matt.* iv. 13. to be the same with that in *John* ii. 12. And that between the going from *Capernaum*, v. 12. and the going up to *Jerusalem*, v. 13. Christ preached for some Months about *Galilee*, as is related by *St. Matthew*, c. iv. and following.

These

These Reasons do, I think, seem to make it very probable that the Three do here mean the same Return into *Galilee* with that in *John* i. 43. It seems to me very probable that St. *Matthew* in c. xi. did pass by the first Passover, *i. e.* between v. 1. and v. 2. 'Tis plain that what is related, v. 2. was after that *Jesus* was come out of *Judea*, *John* iv. because that before his going to the Passover, *John Baptist* was not in Prison; and as this coming out of *Judea* was but few Months before the second Passover, and as the second Passover does come in at c. xii. 1. Therefore 'tis probable that the Place where St. *Matthew* begins his History of what followed upon this Return into *Galilee*, should not be far back from c. xii. Here seems also a sort of Interruption in the Course of St. *Matthew's* History, which may indeed reasonably be expected, next after the sending out of the Apostles. Whoever observes the manner of his Expressions in v. 1. and those in v. 2. will guess that there was a good Space of Time between; for the Words, v. 2. seem plainly to begin a History *de novo*. There can't be a more probable Time supposed for this sending out of the Apostles than this, *viz.* when Christ was to be absent from *Galilee* for about 9 Months.

Now as 'tis plain, from St. *Matthew*, that this sending out of the Apostles was between the Return into *Galilee*, c. iv. 12. and the second Passover, c. xii. 1. and as Christ's Return into *Galilee* after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment was (as was before shewn) but about 3 Months before the second Passover, then this does much increase the Difficulties beforementioned, *i. e.* concerning the many Passages related by St. *Matthew* during this Space of Time. For by this, it would be reasonable

sonable to suppose that *Matthew* had been absent from Christ a great part of this Time; and there appears a very great Probability that he has related very few Passages, after his being called, but what he was an Eye-Witness of; for else he would hardly have omitted all the Passages in *Judea* during all the former part of Christ's Ministry.

This Supposition does also seem to be confirmed by the Account which is here given concerning *John* sending his two Disciples to Christ. 'Tis reasonable to think that he would take the first Opportunity, after he was imprisoned, of sending his Disciples; for as his Reason for sending 'em seems plainly to be, that they, by seeing the Miracles that Christ wrought, and by hearing the Testimony which Christ gave (as to their Master) of himself, might embrace his Religion, and a Faith in him. And when *John* was imprisoned by *Herod*, he must know that his Life was then very uncertain, as being in the Hands of a Tyrant, and therefore 'tis not probable that he would wait very long before he sent his Disciples. And had he been imprisoned before Christ's Return into *Galilee*, c. iv. 12. he must now have lain a few Months in Prison, even tho' it could be supposed that this Return into *Galilee* was the same with that in *John* iv. and therefore he must (since his Disciples were allowed to come to him) a good while before, have heard in the Prison, the Works of Christ. So that, both from the manner of St. *Matthew's* Expression, and by the Nature of the Case, one might judge that *John* had been but lately imprisoned when he sent his two Disciples.

What is here added by St. *Matthew*, concerning Christ's upbraiding the Cities, does also add

some farther Probability to such a Supposition; For as 'tis plain that this was spoken by Christ before he went to the second Passover; and if the Miracles and Preachings of Christ in *Galilee*, had began after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment, this would not have been above 2 or 3 Months before the Time of his upbraiding the Cities: Now it does not seem very reasonable to think that Christ should upbraid the People for want of a general Repentance, after only 2 or 3 Months time of Miracles and Preachings. It would be much more reasonable to suppose that he had himself been among 'em for some Months before the Passover, teaching, and doing many Miracles in confirmation of his Doctrine: And had also sent out his Apostles among them for several Months more, *who went out and preached that Men should repent*, *Marc vi. 12.* and indeed it may not be improbable that this upbraiding of the Cities, might be upon the Apostles Return to Christ. *Matthew* does not indeed mention this Return of the Apostles, and *Marc* and *Luc* do both set it considerably later than is here supposed; but then 'tis also plain that they both set the sending of 'em out a good deal later than *Matthew* does; for they both set it a good while after the Mention of the second Passover, and *St. Matthew* sets it before, as these Texts shew, *Matt. x. 1, &c.* and *xii. 1.* *Marc ii. 23.* and *vi. 7.* *Luc vi. 1.* and *ix. 1.* Had *St. Matthew* mentioned this Return of the Apostles, 'tis probable that he would have set it before the second Passover; for *Marc* and *Luc* (tho' they do not (especially *St. Luc*) indeed much observe order of Time) do both set the Return of the Apostles a little below the sending of 'em out. And this does also make this Matter a little more probable;

for 'tis not at all probable that the Apostles did return to Christ in a short time; and therefore 'tis not improbable that *Marc* and *Luc* do here (between the sending out, and the Return of the Apostles) pass over those Months which Christ tarried in *Judæa*, *John* ii. iii.

When our Saviour said to the Nobleman, *John* iv. 48. *Except ye see Signs and Wonders, ye will not believe*; this would seem a pretty plain Indication that there had been Preachings about *Galilee* before this time; for 'tis not probable that he would else upbraid them with Unbelief. Now as the History lies in *John* ii. our Saviour, when he first came into *Galilee*, wrought his first Miracle in *Cana*, then, went down to *Capernaum*, and in some Days, went up to *Jerusalem*; and 'tis plain by his Account, that Christ did not come again into *Galilee*, till this Time of the Nobleman's coming; and 'tis also plain that the Nobleman came to Christ as soon as he heard that he was come into *Galilee*. Now this would seem to add a very great Probability to what was before supposed, *i. e.* that St. *John* in c. ii. did pass over some Months in which Christ preached, &c. about *Galilee*. And whoever supposes that Christ began his Ministry for some Months before the first Passover, will little doubt that the Three do give the Narrative of it; and will also suppose that the Apostles were sent out before this Passover.

'Tis indeed said *John* iv. 54. *This is again the second (a second) Miracle that Jesus did when he was come out of Judæa into Galilee*. But 'tis manifest that St. *John*'s meaning here is no more than to say, this is a second that I have mentioned. This seems indeed the first Miracle that Christ wrought upon this second Return into *Galilee*, but this does no ways shew that there had been but one

wrought upon his first Return into *Galilee*, c. i. 43. *St. John* uses the same Expression, c. xxi. 14. and yet 'tis sure he does not here mean that this was the very third Time that *Jesus* shewed himself to his Disciples. See *Dr. Wall* on these Texts.

When it is said that *Jesus sent out the twelve*, this need not be taken in so strict a Sense; but that it may be thought probable that Christ did retain some few of them to himself, whenever it was that they were sent out, and whither-soever it was that he himself went; when *he departed thence to teach and to preach in their Cities*, after *he had made an end of commanding his twelve Disciples*, *Matt. xi. 1.* But as I think it does seem (as I said) both from the Expressions of *St. Matthew* in this place, and from several other Reasons) very probable that Christ did then go up to *Jerusalem* at the first Passover, teaching and preaching in the Cities he pass'd thro': So 'tis probable that some few of the Apostles might now go up to *Jerusalem* with our Saviour and tarry with him in *Judæa* and baptize. There might also be more Disciples which were not of the Twelve. And it seems very reasonable to suppose that *St. John* was then with Christ at *Jerusalem* and tarried with him in *Judæa*; by his reciting so particularly, the Discourses of Christ with the *Jews*, with *Nicodemus*, with the *Samaritan Woman*, &c. And indeed there can't be a better Reason given, why the Three have omitted all these Passages at *Jerusalem* and in *Judæa*, during all the former part of Christ's Ministry, of which *St. John* gives a particular Relation; than by supposing that *St. Matthew*, and those who delivered the History to *Marc* and *Luc*, were not with our Saviour in *Judæa* at these Times, but

that St. *John* was ; see Dr. *Wall* on *John* x. 40.

Now this very thing would seem a pretty plain Proof that Christ's Return into *Galilee*, *Matt.* iv. 12. was not after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment ; for it is no ways reasonable to think that St. *John* should (before he was called, *Matt.* iv. 21.) go with Christ to *Jerusalem*, and tarry with him there and in *Judæa*, for about 9 Months. And supposing that St. *John* was one of those Disciples of *John Baptist*, spoken of, tho' not named, *John* i. 40. (as seems probable, see *Ham. in loc.*) And supposing (which is very improbable) that this was but very little before the first Passover, and that St. *John* did then follow *Jesus* into *Galilee* (which seems not improbable) and from thence to *Jerusalem* : yet it would not be reasonable to think that St. *John*, after he had been a Follower of *Jesus* for 9 or 10 Months, should forsake him to follow his Trade of Fishing.

It would be something tedious to reckon up all the inconvenient Circumstances which do seem to attend this Case ; but these are, I think, sufficient to make it appear highly probable that the Three do begin their Histories of the Miracles and Preachings of Christ, before the Time of *John Baptist's* Imprisonment. And therefore I will proceed to mention what other Circumstances I can think of, to shew a Probability that there has been an Insertion of some Words into these Texts of *Matt.* and *Marc*, by some Scribes in the very early Times ; and will add a Conjecture concerning their Reason for so doing.

1. 'Tis something observable that the Three, (*Matt.* ix. 14. *Marc* ii. 18. *Luc* v. 23.) speaking of *John's* Disciples coming to Christ, do here say nothing of *John* being in Prison : and yet St. *Matthew*, c. xi. 2, speaking of their coming a
second

second time, does here say that *John* was then in Prison. This makes some Probability that *John* was not imprisoned at the Time mentioned, *Matt. ix. 14.*

2. 'Tis farther observable that *St. Luc, c. vii. 19.* relating this second coming of *John's* Disciples, does not here mention *John's* being in Prison, which yet *St. Matthew* does, *c. xi. 2.* This would seem to make some Question whether *St. Matthew* had before spoke any thing of *John's* Imprisonment. *St. Luc* had mentioned it, *c. iii. 20.* *St. Marc* does not mention this second coming of *John's* Disciples.

3. The manner in which *St. John* has related this Matter, does, I think, seem something remarkable. He having (*c. iii.*) said that *Jesus* came, with his Disciples, from *Jerusalem* into the Country of *Judæa*, and that he there tarried with them and baptized, he subjoins, *v. 23, &c. And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much Water there, and they came and were baptized. (For John was not yet cast into Prison.) Then there arose a Question, &c.* It may be observed that here seems no direct Occasion for *St. John* to introduce those Words, *v. 24.* for his Reader could want no advertising that *John Baptist* was not then in Prison, since (as *St. John* had said, in the Words immediately foregoing) he was then baptizing in *Enon*. This (all the foregoing Circumstances being considered) would seem to make a Probability that *St. John* had himself observed that this Matter had been wrong stated in the then Copies of *Matthew* and *Marc*: and, that he, having here an Occasion to shew that *John Baptist* was at liberty, and baptizing in *Enon*, at a Time when his Reader (who should also read the other Gospels) would be apt to conclude

clude from *Matthew* and *Marc*, that *John Baptist* was then in Prison: He, I say, to certify this Reader that the Case was otherwise, added (by way of Parenthesis) the Words, v. 24.

4. It seems not unworthy of Notice in this Case, to observe the manner in which St. *Luc* has delivered this part of the History. He, when he was, c. iii. giving the Relation of the Preaching, &c. of *John Baptist*, did there go through with the History of *John*, so far as to his Imprisonment, before he came to speak of Christ's Return into *Galilee*, c. iv. 14. I don't think his meaning to be, that this Return into *Galilee* was after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment, only he set the latter before the former, in the Method of his Book.

All this being considered, I am very apt to believe that St. *Matthew* (according to the Terms he had used in some foregoing Texts, c. iii. 13. c. iv. 1, &c.) had written in c. iv. 12. only thus [Then *Jesus* departed into *Galilee*] and that St. *Marc* had written in c. i. 14. only thus [And *Jesus* came into *Galilee*, &c.]

Now supposing that this Case might stand thus in the Three, the Scribes might imagine St. *Luc's* meaning to be, that *John* was imprisoned before the Time that *Jesus* returned into *Galilee*: and so might any one think, in such Case, who did not see St. *John's* Gospel; for all the inconvenient Circumstances before mentioned, would vanish, were it not for the Account in St. *John*, i. e. that *John Baptist* was not imprisoned, till a considerable time after our Saviour had began his Ministry. And the Scribes might see that the Return into *Galilee*, *Luc* iv. 14. was the same with that in *Matt.* iv. and *Marc* i. They might think that *Matthew* and *Marc* were so to be understood, as they

they took *Luc* to mean, (i. e. that *John* was imprisoned before *Jesus* returned into *Galilee*) tho' they had not so expressed it: and might think it would help to illustrate the Sense to a Reader (in order for conceiving a good Harmony between the Three in this Matter) to have these Texts filled up with the Words [When *Jesus* had heard that *John* was cast into Prison: and, After that *John* was put in Prison.] Possibly some interpreting Scribe might first set these Words in the Margin, as thinking that was the Sense of the Places, and some of the next Copiers might think they were, or ought to be, a part of the Texts, and so put 'em in.

It may be said, that St. *Luc* had spoke of *John's* Imprisonment, before he mentioned Christ's Baptism and Temptation, and so, that the Scribes might see that he did not write in a Chronological Order, and therefore, that they would be at a Loss (if they would offer at an Amendment) where to place the Imprisonment of *John* in the Two. 'Tis true, they might be sure that *John* was not imprisoned before Christ was baptized; but then, since the Imprisonment of *John* is here brought in, they might think he was imprisoned soon after Christ was baptized, and might, no doubt, be the more induced to think so, from the Words, *v. 21. Now when all the People were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also, &c.* And they might see from *Marc i. 12.* that the Temptation immediately followed the Baptism, and so might well think that *John* could hardly be imprisoned before Christ had entered on his Fasting, but that he might be imprisoned in some time of it, and so, might think it best to set the Imprisonment at the next Passage, viz. at the Return into *Galilee*.

This

This Alteration (if it be one) must have been very early, *viz.* before St. *John* wrote his Gospel; both because he seems, as was said, to have inserted those cautionary Words, c. iii. 24. on purpose to obviate this Error; and also because that after his Gospel came abroad, no Scribe would attempt any such thing. If this was so early an Insertion, it can't be expected that there should be now any MS. or Author left, to correct it.

St. *John's* Gospel is supposed not to have been written till 30 or 40 Years after the latest of the Three, (full 40 if *Luc* wrote after *Marc*) so that here was time enough for such an Error to have crept in; and it might be late enough to have no one then (at hand) living, who might be able to prevent it; for supposing it to have been done 10 Years before St. *John* wrote, *i. e.* about *An.* 86 or 88. this would be near 60 Years after *John Baptist* was imprisoned. And as for Tradition, that is always uncertain; besides, such a Thing as the Time of his Imprisonment, might not be generally talked of.

Whether St. *John* may be supposed to have seen any of the original Copies of the Three, or any of the very first Transcripts of 'em, I pretend not to judge. If these Insertions were made in *Matt.* and *Marc*, it may be thought probable that they were made in both at one time by some *Greek* Scribes. 'Tis thought that *Matt.* was translated a great while before the Time that St. *John* wrote his Gospel; see Dr. *Wall's* Pref. to *Matt.* If it be thought that St. *John* might see either the very original Copies of *Matt.* and *Marc*, or some of the very first Transcripts of 'em, in which these Texts might be different from what they are in the present Copies, yet if he did afterward,

ward, before he wrote his Gospel, come to see some later Copies, in which the Scribes might have made such Insertions, it would be then proper for him to give that Caution to his Reader, c. iii. 24.

I made a Question whether *Luc* wrote after *Marc*; see Dr. *Wall*, on 2 *Pet.* i. 15. *it.* on *Acts* xxviii. 30. *it.* *Pref.* to *Luc.* If *Marc* wrote after St. *Paul's* Departure from *Rome*, which was about *An.* 63. And as 'tis probable that *Luc* published his Book of *Acts* about this Time, for if he had deferred it to some later Year, he would probably have added some farther Passages of St. *Paul's* Life, and as 'tis plain that his Gospel was published before the *Acts*; if the Case were so, then *Marc* must have wrote some time after *Luc.* That *Marc* mentioned by the Doctor on 1 *Pet.* v. 13. is said to have died *An.* 62. which was a Year or two too early to agree with *Irenaeus.* But 'tis, it seems, uncertain whether this *Marc* wrote the Gospel. As *Marc* does not mention any of those things, *John* i. 41. to ii. 12. at which Passages one might judge *Peter* to have been present: nor any of the Passages in *Judaea*, till the last time of Christ's going thither (at most, or some, of which Passages one might judge *Peter* also to have been present, see *Acts* x. 39.) it may perhaps be doubted whether That *Marc* whom St. *Peter* calls His Son, wrote the Gospel; and whether That Tradition which says, *Peter dictated the Gospel to Marc*, be of undoubtful Authority. *Marcus* Sister's Son to *Barnabas* was at *Rome* a little before St. *Paul* went from thence, *Col.* iv. 10. One might judge by *Irenaeus* that it was this *Marc* that wrote the Gospel. This could not be That *Marc* whom St. *Peter* calls His Son, if the Tradition be true which says that That *Marc* died

died *An. 62.* because This *Marc* was living 5 Years afterward, 2 *Tim. iv. 11.* I suppose *Irenæus's* Testimony is considerable, and I think, 'tis reasonably supposed that *St. Paul* did not go to *Rome* till 60 or 61. However in this matter it makes but little Difference (and I know not whether the Time of *Marc's* writing be very material to know) for if *Marc* did write something after 63. this would be above 30 Years before *St. John* wrote.

Now if it can be thought probable that there has been such an Interpolation in these Texts as is here supposed, then I think that what has been ere said, with regard to the Distribution of some Passages in the former part of Christ's Ministry, *The sending out of the Apostles, &c.* may not be thought an improbable Conjecture. Now possibly there may from hence be some probable Conjectures made concerning some particular Passages, why they are related by some one Evangelist, and not by any of the other; for tho' this be not, in general, of any great Moment, because 'tis not to be thought that any one (nor all 4 together) of 'em did record near all the Miracles, &c. in the Time of Christ's Ministry; yet in some Cases, and where the Reasons may be guessed at, it may not perhaps be amiss to make some Conjectures of 'em.

1. Now from this Account, there may perhaps be a probable Reason supposed, why only *St. John* mentions the Cure of the Nobleman's Son, c. iv. viz. that most of the Twelve having been sent out to preach, &c. about *Galilee*, but (as is probable) *St. John*, and possibly some few other of the Apostles (perhaps *Peter* and *James*) going with Christ to *Jerusalem* at the first Passover, and tarrying with Him in *Judæa* for several Months,

and now coming back with Him ; St. *John* might be present when the Nobleman came to Christ at *Cana*, (which seems to have been soon after He came into *Galilee*, v. 47.) but St. *Matthew*, and they who delivered the History to *Marc* and *Luc* (being probably of the Number of those who were left in *Galilee*) might not yet be returned to our Saviour.

2. This may possibly be a Reason why only St. *Luc* recorded the Miracle at *Nain*. St. *Luc* did, least of all, observe Order of Time ; he says, c. vii. 11. that this Miracle at *Nain* was wrought the Day after the Cure of the Centurion's Servant at *Capernaum*. Now this seems plainly the same Cure with that in *Matt*. viii. (for the little Differences in the History, see *Ham. Wall*, &c.) It should seem the same, not only by agreeing mostly in Words, &c. but also because St. *Luc* in the Chapter before has some of the same Sermon which St. *Matthew* has recorded, c. v, vi, vii. See Dr. *Wall* on *Luc* vi. 20. Now 'tis plain from St. *Matthew* that this Sermon, and the Cure of the Centurion's Servant which followed soon after, were before he was called ; St. *Luc* c. v. sets the Cure of the *Leper* (which St. *Matthew* says, was between the Sermon, and the Cure of the Centurion's Servant) much about the same Time that *Matthew* does. By the Account of some Geographers, *Nain* should be something more than a Day's Journey, distant from *Capernaum*. Now tho' St. *Luc* do say that this Miracle at *Nain* was the Day after the Cure of the Centurion's Servant, yet as he does, when he has mentioned the Raising of the Widow's Son, say, *And John's Disciples shewed him of all these things, and John calling unto him two of his Disciples, sent them to Jesus*, &c. And as this coming of *John's* Dis-

ciples must be after that *Jesus* was come out of *Judæa*, *John* iv. and probably not very long after; and as neither *Matthew* nor *Marc* do record this Miracle, therefore I should be apt to think that this Miracle at *Nain* might be wrought in the Time between the Cure of the Nobleman's Son, *John* iv. and the Coming of *John's* Disciples, *Matt.* xi. And that the Reason of *Matthew* and *Marc* omitting it, may be, That St. *Luc* might have this part of the History from some Apostle who had returned to our Saviour something sooner than either St. *Matthew*, or they who delivered the History to St. *Marc*, did. For as they had been sent out by Two and Two, it can hardly be thought that they could all return about the same time, for some would be at nearer, some at more distant, places; and if this Account be a probable one, *i. e.* that they were sent out when our Saviour went to the first Passover, then they who happened to be at places remote from *Cana*, (whither our Saviour first came upon this return into *Galilee*) might be some time before they heard of Christ being returned into *Galilee*; and when they did hear, 'tis possible that Christ might be removed to some other Place, before they reached the Place where they had heard he had been; and by what is related by St. *Matthew* from c. xi. 1. to c. xii. one might judge that he might not be one of those that returned very soon. St. *Luc* does indeed say that many of Christ's Disciples went with him to *Nain*: But the Word *Disciples* must often be taken to mean other Followers of Christ, beside the *Apostles*. Besides, 'tis possible that a good many of the Twelve might be there. St. *John* may be supposed to have been present; but the Reason of his omitting it (if he were present) may be obviously conceived.

3. This may make a pretty good Reason why none of the Three do mention any of those things which St. *John* does, as done and spoken by our Saviour at *Jerusalem* and in *Judæa*, at the first Passover, and for several Months following. Dr. *Wall*, on *John* x. 40. says, “ *Matthew* could not be at the first Passover : for he was not called to be a Disciple till after that time, nor till after *John Baptist*’s Imprisonment, (as any one will perceive that reads his History) and he in his Gospel, passes over all that time.” This the Doctor spoke, on occasion, no doubt, of what is said, *Matt.* iv. 12. for there is no other Account in St. *Matthew* by which one can judge that he was called so late; and if this must be thought to be genuine, then not only *Matthew*, but *Peter*, *Andrew*, *James*, and *John*, were called after *John Baptist* was imprisoned, and yet I think the Doctor here plainly supposes St. *John* to have been called much sooner, and to have been at this Passover; and it was, no doubt, a very reasonable Supposition. But if it can be thought probable that most of the Twelve were sent out to preach about *Galilee* while our Saviour went to the first Passover and tarried in *Judæa* for some Months, then it may be reasonable enough to think that neither *Matthew* nor they that delivered the History to *Marc* and *Luc*, might go with Christ into *Judæa* at this time, and so, may make a good Reason why all the Three did omit these Passages in *Judæa*: And this may also make a Probability that the same might happen at some of the following times that *Jesus* went to *Jerusalem*: for tho’ ’tis very probable that Christ did not tarry in *Judæa* near so long at any of the following times, and tho’ there be not any more mention of sending out the Twelve,

Twelve, yet 'tis not improbable that they might, most of 'em, be left to preach in *Galilee* while *Jesus* went up to *Jerusalem*: For besides their great Work in preaching up the Christian Religion to all *Galilee*, it must be supposed that they did also baptize all their Converts, and their Children, and this would take up their whole Time; and as to any baptizing in *Judæa*, it seems, I think (for Reasons to be mentioned by and by) to have lasted only during those Months that Christ tarried in *Judæa*, after the first Passover. But besides all this, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that our Blessed Saviour would not have a Number of Disciples to follow him to *Jerusalem*, (because he seems to have avoided giving too great Umbrage to the *Pbarisees*) till the last time, when *He knew that His Hour was come*; and then also it was necessary that they should all go, to be Witnesses to His Death, Resurrection, &c.

4. The Account before given from Dr. Hammond, i. e. that St. *John* was, probably one of those Disciples spoken of, *John* i. 35—40. may not be an improbable Reason why only St. *John* has recorded the first Miracle in *Cana*; viz. that he (as is probable) coming now with *Jesus* into *Galilee*, might be present at this Miracle, which seems to have been wrought presently after the coming into *Galilee*; but the Three might have this part of the History from some who were not quite so early with Christ. The Doctor (Note on *John* i. g.) does indeed seem to question whether *John*, &c. did then follow *Jesus* into *Galilee*. St. *John* does not indeed here say that *Jesus* ordered any of 'em to follow him, but only *Philip*. But then as he says, c. ii. 2, 12. that *Jesus* had Disciples with him at *Cana*, it would seem probable that most, or all, of the Five did then follow

low

low our Saviour into *Galilee*; and it seems probable that, soon after this, *Peter*, *Andrew*, and *John*, together with *James*, and *Zebedee*, Father of *James* and *John*, went to their Occupation of Fishing: but they seem to have continued at it but little while; for where St. *John* says, c. ii. 12. *Jesus went down to Capernaum—and they continued there not many Days*; this seems the very same going to *Capernaum* with that *Matt. iv. 13.* and the next thing recorded by St. *Matthew* is, *From that time Jesus began to preach.—And Jesus walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw two Brethren, Simon, &c.* They who think that the Three do begin their History of Christ's Miracles and Preachings, after *John Baptist's* Imprisonment, must suppose this Calling of *Peter*, &c. from Fishing, to have been a Year after their first coming to Christ. This I take to be the least; for if *Daniel's* Prophecy be to be regarded in this Matter (as surely it ought) then it must be supposed that Christ's Ministry begun in *November, A. D. 29.* and the soonest time that can well be supposed for *John Baptist's* Imprisonment, is *December, A. D. 30.* and then some time must be supposed (after *John* was imprisoned) for Christ's Return into *Galilee*, and his going to call *Peter*, &c. Besides, I believe it may appear probable (from what may be said presently) that *John's* Imprisonment was something later. Now this does not seem at all probable, viz. that these 4 Disciples (3 of whom were some of the most considerable Apostles) should not have been called to be constant Followers of Christ till a third Part of the Time of His Ministry was over.

It does, I think, seem something probable that Christ did not do any Miracles during those 8 or 9 Months that he tarried in *Judæa*, after his
Return

Return from the first Passover; at least, St. *John* does not mention any: He does not expressly mention any Miracles that Christ wrought at *Jerusalem*, only, The Driving the Buyers, &c. out of the Temple: But tho' he does not particularly mention any, yet his Words do, I think, plainly suppose that several were wrought, see c. ii. 23. iii. 2. iv. 45. Our Blessed Saviour seems to have been pleased so to order it, that while the main Body of the People were at the Passover, He there wrought several Miracles, that they might all have an Opportunity of being convinced of the Truth of his Doctrine, and that He was the Messiah: but when he came into the Country Places of *Judaea*, he seems to have forborn doing any Miracles there, that the People of *Judaea* might thereby have an Opportunity to come in (as many as would embrace His Religion) and be baptized; for if he had continued to work Miracles of Healing, &c. in *Judaea*, 'tis probable that the *Sanhedrim* would have endeavoured to molest Him. This seems probable, because it appears from *John* iv. 1. that the *Pharisees* were disturbed at the Numbers that came to be baptized: But if Christ had then wrought many Miracles, 'tis probable he would have had a much greater Concourse of People.

When St. *John* here says, *When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John, he left Judaea, &c.* It is not very certain from these, and the foregoing Words, whether *John* were imprisoned before the Time that Christ now returned into *Galilee*. One Reason that I had for supposing *John* to have been imprisoned before this Return of Christ into *Galilee*, is, because, as was said, I think that St. *Matthew* begins his

History

History of what followed upon this Return into Galilee, with the coming of *John's* Disciples, c. xi. 2. (but this can't be supposed by those who think that *John* was imprisoned before the Return into Galilee, c. iv. 12.) But tho' this be supposed (as so indeed it does seem to be) and tho' St. *Matthew* has related but few Passages between this coming of *John's* Disciples, c. xi. 2. and the second Passover, c. xii. 1. (between which Return of Christ into Galilee, and which second Passover, there were about 3 Months, as was before shewn) yet there may be good Reason (as was before said) to suppose that St. *Matthew* might not return to our Saviour till a good while after He came into Galilee; and therefore there may be room for supposing that *John Baptist* might have been imprisoned between the Time of Christ's Return into Galilee, *John* iv. 43. and the coming of *John's* Disciples, *Matt.* xi. 2. Dr. *Wall*, on *Matt.* iv. 12. does plainly suppose that *John Baptist* was not imprisoned before Christ's Return into Galilee, *John* iv. And indeed, so far as one may be able to judge by the Tenour of St. *John's* Words in this Place, I must own that it does seem most probable (as the Doctor judged) that *John* was not then imprisoned; for

1. When St. *John*, c. iii. says, *Jesus tarried in Judæa*, and then adds, *For John was not yet cast into Prison*; one might judge that St. *John* by the Word *tarried*, did mean all, or near all, the Time that *Jesus* did then tarry in *Judæa*.

2. 'Tis plain that *Jesus* left *Judæa* and departed again into Galilee as soon as he knew how the Pharisees had heard that, &c. And it seems also pretty plain, both from the Nature of the Case, and from the Expressions of St. *John*, that our Saviour came to hear of this Matter (i. e. how the Pharisees

Pharisees had heard, &c.) from *John Baptist* or his [*John's*] Disciples; for when *St. John* had said, c. iii. 26. *And they* (the *Jews*, who were I suppose, *Jews* of *Jerusalem*) *came unto John*, and *said unto him*, *Rabbi*, *He that was with thee—the same baptizeth*, &c. He subjoins, c. iv. 1. *When therefore the Lord knew how*, &c. There is no Reason to suppose that *St. John's* Meaning here is, that *Christ* knew this Matter from his divine Knowledge. The most obvious Meaning of the Context seems to be, that those *Jews* who came to *John Baptist* did (if they were not themselves *Pharisees*) either acquaint *John* of what the *Pharisees* had heard concerning *Christ's* making and baptizing, &c. Or else *John* knew from the Nature of the Case, and of the Men, and their Discourse, that they would acquaint the *Pharisees* of this Matter, and then *John*, either by Word or Message, told *Jesus* of what Discourse those *Jews* had had with him.

3. It seems probable that *John*, when those *Jews* came to him, was not within *Herod's* Jurisdiction, whose Tetrarchy was *Galilee*; for *St. John* says he was then at *Enon*, near *Salem*, which Towns some Geographers place within *Samaria*, which was out of *Herod's* Jurisdiction.

4. When *St. John* says, *the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John*. This should seem to mean a Time when both *Jesus* and *John* were baptizing; for it can hardly mean that *Jesus* made and baptized more than *John* had made; for tho' *Jesus* did no doubt (by his Disciples) baptize a great many in *Judaea*, yet it can't be thought that He did, in those 8 or 9 Months, baptize more than *John* had done in 4 Years; and *St. John* subjoins (as the immediate Consequent of *Christ's* hearing, or knowing,

ing, how the *Pharisees* had heard, &c.) He left *Judæa*, &c.

These Circumstances would incline any Reader to think that *John* was not imprisoned before our Saviour did then return into *Galilee*; 'tis probable that it was not very long after; all that is certain in the Case, is, that he was imprisoned before the second Passover, both by St. *Matthew's* Words, c. xi. 2. and also by our Saviour's Words, *John* v. 35. This would not make any considerable Difference in the Time of *John's* Imprisonment, but it would much increase the Difficulties concerning the Words *Matt.* iv. 12. and *Marc* i. 14. Neither does there seem any manner of Probability that our Saviour did go again into *Judæa*, till he went to the second Passover, *John* v. 1. *Matt.* xii. 1. So that I put the Case at the best when I reckoned up those Difficulties; for to think that the Return into *Galilee*, *Matt.* iv. 12. was not before what is related, c. xii. 1. would make an utter Inconsistency in St. *Matthew's* History.

I know that many Expositors (*Usher*, *Hammond*, *Mill*, &c.) do make that Return into *Galilee*, *Matt.* iv. 12. to be the same with that in *John* iv. But I think Dr. *Wall's* Opinion preferable in this Case, when he says (on *Matt.* iv. 12.) *Before John's Imprisonment*, St. *John's Gospel* mentions *Christ's* going out of *Judæa* into *Galilee*, once c. i. 43. Another time, c. iv. 3. Therefore this must be a second, or, I think, a third, time of coming out of *Judæa* into *Galilee*, &c.

I don't say that this Opinion will, by any means, suit all Circumstances, but yet I think the Doctor judged rightly, that *John* was not imprisoned before *Christ* returned that second time into *Galilee*, *John* iv. 3.

Had there been no other Reasons against supposing *John* to have been imprisoned before Christ's Return into *Galilee*, *Matt.* iv. 12. the Sense of these Words in *St. John* might have been a little streined in order to a Reconcilement; but when there appear so many other Reasons, 'tis better to suppose an Insertion of the Scribes than to allow so many inconvenient Suppositions.

Less important Circumstances than what do seem to attend this Case, would incline any diligent Reader to suppose an Insertion of the Scribes (since 'tis too plain that some such Things have been done) only this Case happens to be something particular; both because it happens to be in two Gospels, and also because it must have been so very early. But as to its being in two Gospels, any one will readily conceive that whoever would go about to make an Insertion in one, would not fail to do it in the other. And as to its being so early, if it can be supposed to be done at a Time which was beyond the Reach of Memory (as I think this may) then there is very little more Difficulty in supposing it to be done at such a Time, than if it were thought to have been done a Century or two later. And tho' *St. John* did live to a great Age, probably to near 100, yet there is no Appearance that any other of the Apostles lived near so long. And the Gospels of the Three might be mostly copied out in places far remote from *Ephesus*, &c. where *St. John* was.

If it be said, that if *St. John* did see these Texts in *Matt.* and *Marc.* and know 'em to be Errors, that he would endeavour to have 'em corrected. That is a very doubtful Case; 'tis much question whether *St. John* would advise such a thing; and if he would, yet if there were great
Numbers

Numbers of Copies so written, (and especially if the Words were in the Text, and taken to be the genuine Words of *Matt.* and *Marc*) the Authority of *St. John* himself might perhaps not prevail to have any Alteration made.

As several learned and judicious Men have supposed some Insertions of the Scribes, where neither any various Lectons in the MSS. nor any other Circumstances, do give any Light to guess at what Time they might have been made; so 'tis possible that some might be as early as this, if it be one.

I am very sensible that no such thing should ever be suggested without very apparent Reasons, and on a well-grounded Supposition, which has made me to dwell the longer on this Subject. The Case does so appear to me. But this (as well as all the rest is, or so intended to be) is proposed with humble Deference to the learned Reader.

Tho' I have been something prolix on this Subject, yet because it does, I think, well deserve a Consideration, and lest it should be thought I have been too petulant in the Suppositions here laid down, I will trespass on the Reader's Patience while I mention one more Circumstance, which I have since observed, and which will, I think, pretty much confirm all that has been here advanced.

St. John c. iv. 43—46 says, *Now after two Days he departed thence and went into Galilee, for Jesus himself testified (or had testified) that a Prophet has no Honour in his own Country—So Jesus came again into Cana of Galilee, &c.* *St. John's* Meaning here is, That Christ did not then go to *Nazareth*, where he had been educated, because he had before been there, Preaching, &c. and had been rejected by 'em, and *had testified that, &c.*

Now

Now this can't mean that going to *Nazareth* mention'd by *St. Matt. c. xiii. 54.* and by *St. Marc c. vi. 1.* because this was a good while after Christ's Return into *Galilee*, *John iv.* and therefore it must mean that going to *Nazareth*, *Luc iv. 16.* So that it seems Christ did more than once go to *Nazareth*, and upon their Incredulity *did testify that, &c.* And whoever compares these Places will see that this going to *Nazareth*, *Luc iv.* was not the same with that in *Matt. xiii.* and *Marc vi.*

By a diligent comparing of the Three, 'twill appear that some Passages that occurred upon Christ's first Return into *Galilee*, do lie in this Order, viz. Our Saviour first went to *Capernaum*, *Matt. iv. 13.* This going to *Capernaum* is not mention'd by *Marc c. 1.* nor by *Luc c. iv.* but is included in the general Expressions (*Marc i. 14. Luc iv. 15.*) and *Luc c. iv. 23.* does say that Christ had been at *Capernaum*. Then he called *Peter, &c. Matt. iv. 18. Marc i. 16.* Then he went to many Places, *Teaching in their Synagogues, &c. Matt. iv. 23.* and to *Nazareth* for one, *Luc iv. 16.* preaching in their Synagogue; but they supposing him to be *Joseph's Son*, would not receive his Doctrine; and then Christ said to 'em, *v. 24.* (which *St. John* recites, *c. iv. 44.*) *No Prophet is accepted in his own Country.* Then from thence he came down to *Capernaum*, *Luc iv. 31.* Now this was the very same going to *Capernaum* mention'd *Matt. viii. 5. Marc i. 21.* for then Christ cured the *Demoniac*, *Luc iv. 33. Marc i. 23.* and then cured *Peter's Wife's Mother*, *Luc iv. 38. Marc i. 29. Matt. viii. 14.* and at Sun-set cured many that were diseased, *&c. ibid. ib. ib.* *St. Luc* does indeed postpone the calling of *Peter, &c. to c. v.* but then 'tis manifest by

by his relating the Cure of *Peter's Wife's Mother*, c. iv. 38. that they had before been called. See *Marc i. 16—21.*

Now as 'tis plain from St. *John's Words*, c. iv. 44. that Christ had before the first Passover been at *Nazareth*, and *had testified that*, &c. And as this makes it plain that St. *John* in c. ii. did pass over some space of time in which Christ preached about *Galilee*; so also 'tis, I think, more than probable, that the time when Jesus *had testified that*, &c. *John iv.* was the same with that in *Luc iv.* And as Christ did then go down to *Capernaum*, and as 'tis plain that this going to *Capernaum* was the same with that in *Matt. viii.* and *Marc i.* Therefore whoever will please to compare these Circumstances, will, I think, no longer doubt that Christ did begin his Ministry for some Months before the first Passover, and will suppose that the Three do give a Narrative of the Passages that occurred during these Months, and that this is the Reason that St. *John* passed over 'em, only he relates the first Miracle in *Cana*, which had been omitted by the Three. And if the Case be so, then the forefaid Words in *Matt. iv. 12.* and in *Marc i. 14.* must, as was said, be counted irreptitious.

And as this makes it very probable that Christ's Ministry did begin about five Months before the first Passover, as was before supposed; so also 'tis no small Reason for supposing the forefaid Computation of *Daniel's seventy Weeks* to be a proper one. And indeed whoever will please to observe the whole Circumstances concerning all these Passages here treated on, will, I think, see so strong a Connection between 'em, that there is hardly removing any one Link, but that it will disorder the whole Chain.

I don't indeed pretend by this Method to shew the very Month in which Christ's Ministry begun, only that by the Passages in *St. Matthew* there seems plainly to have been the Space of some Months before the first Passover; and as all the other Circumstances of the Prophecy do seem to require it to have been about five Months, therefore it may reasonably enough be supposed that the Case was so.

Dr. Prideaux, &c. in explaining of *Daniel's* Prophecy, do conclude that Christ began his Ministry three Years and a half before his Passion, *i. e.* (according to their Computation) six Months before the first Passover, *John ii. 13.* Now this can't be supposed, without allowing that *St. John* did here pass over five or six Months. They seem not to have considered this Difficulty; for 'tis (as was before said) very probable that *St. John* would not have passed over such a Space of Time, (not even as four or five Months) had he not observed that the Three had given an Account of the Miracles, &c. of our Saviour during this Space of Time.

F I N I S

E R R A T A

PAge 15. l. 6. for *Achweros*, read *Achsweros*; p. 31. l. 19. for, 4th Month, read, 5th Month; p. 40. l. penult. for, came *Jerusalem*, read, came to *Jerusalem*; p. 93. l. ult. for, 6. read, 6.